

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VII

JUNE, 1907

NO. 12

First Impressions of Socialism Abroad.

6. IN THE PARADISE OF THE CAPITALISTS.

I HAVE come from the "Classic Land of Capitalism" to what Karl Marx has called "The Paradise of the Capitalists."

One would need to be an adept in fine distinctions to make very clear the difference between these two countries. If the working classes of England are poverty stricken and live in great overcrowded and squalid quarters, so do the workers of Belgium. There is one distinction however. There are certain classes of workmen in England who have, by organisation and united action, created for themselves a tolerable existence. In Belgium there is practically no such class. The entire mass of workers, when not actually beneath the poverty line, live but slightly above it. In both the classic land and the paradise the immense body of citizens live in abominable conditions and toil their lives away without hope of enjoying the benefits of modern civilized life.

I was interested to see and to study a paradise of the capitalists. We are wont to think of a paradise as a comfortable joyous place where the people lead happy lives and where the souls of children are full of gladness. Belgium is not such a paradise, though it might well be, if its wealth were but justly distributed. It is a paradise for the capitalist only. This means that in all parts of this tiny country, the smallest in Europe, there are spacious and beautiful estates and handsome châteaux. In other words Belgium has built for itself a new Athens. There are the citizens who participate in the public life, who control the powers of Government and the institutions of the land and who alone enjoy the rich

and abundant opportunities for a happy and peaceful life. Beneath this small group is a nation of poverty. Capitalists have made themselves a paradise; and, in order to support and enrich it, they have made for the people an inferno. Outside of their magnificent estates there is the never-ceasing hum of Industry, the great factories, the mines, the quarries, the vast docks, the wharfs, the little canals stretching throughout the country and the minutely and intensively cultivated fields, where multitudes of men, women and children labor unceasingly. Wherever one travels in Belgium one passes through such a conglomeration of industrial centres as to make one feel as if Packingtown, the great great steel mills of Pittsburg, the mining districts of Pennsylvania, the textile mills of the South and all the docks of the great lakes were crowded together in one little handful of country.

Since 1830 the Capitalists have ruled Belgium and have done with it what they wished. During this time the population has steadily increased until now it is the most dense in Europe. The increase in wealth has been prodigious, and the factories, mines, commerce and cultivation of the soil have developed to such an extent that perhaps no similar bit of space in the universe is so adequately and variously industrialized. The figures of the increase of wealth in Belgium are amazing. Through these years of capitalist domination there has been amassed a wealth of 35 Millions of Francs with an annual revenue of 3 and a half Millions. Louis Bertrand shows that if this wealth were equally partitioned among the people, each family would possess a capital of 25,000 Francs or an annual revenue of 2,500 Francs. This would mean in Belgium, that every man, woman and child would possess a comfortable, and in a small way even a luxurious existence.

But no such distribution of wealth exists under Capitalism. Instead of comfort a hundred seventy thousand workmen or about 25 per cent. of all laborers gained less than 2 Frcs. per day in 1896 and 172,000 workers or 25 per cent. again earned between 2-3 Frcs. per day. This of course means that these workers were under the poverty line and unable to supply themselves and their families with the necessities of life. Perhaps as striking as any of the figures illustrating the poverty in Belgium are those of the dwellings of the workers. In Brussels their conditions are by no means the worst, but 17,597 of the families investigated, or 34 per cent. are forced to live in one room, the sole space they have for sleeping, eating and living. But it is not only in wages or in housing that the worst conditions can be shown. Even the capitalists in the present system can not easily remedy these things. The injustice and wickedness of their rule is perhaps shown more clearly by the woman and child labor and by the resistance always

put forward to the demands of the people for the education of their children. In 1892 the proportion of militiamen in the various European countries who were entirely illiterate was as follows :

(read only

imperfectly)

In the German Empire in 1900.....	0.7	per 1000	
In Sweden	0.8	"	"
In Denmark	0.2	"	"
In Switzerland	20	"	" (read only
In Holland	23	"	" imperfectly)
In England	37	"	"
In France	46	"	"
In Belgium	101	"	"

From these figures it will be seen that the Belgians are by far the most illiterate and poorly educated of all the peoples of Western Europe. It is of course a direct and definite result of capitalist domination. They have wanted the children for their mills and mines and no protest on the part of the people has been effective in preventing the capitalists from exploiting these infants. Their rule in Belgium has been perfect, for as with us, there have been but two parties; when the one was defeated, the other was in power and both parties represented the elements that were enriched by cheap labor.

The population of Belgium therefore is the most oppressed of all those of the industrial countries of Europe. They are badly educated; they work the longest hours at the lowest pay. It would seem therefore impossible to expect from this mass of working people an intelligent and consistent revolt. Indeed this seems to be the opinion of many Belgians. A well known socialist and, it is said, the one most loved, Louis De Brouckère, has written of his own country in the following words: "Belgium, the battle field of Europe, has known for many centuries nothing but uninterrupted oppression. Spain, Austria and France fought for our provinces which had already suffered from the brutal treatment of the Dukes of Burgundy. The rival powers took possession of them, lost them and took them again at various intervals. At every new conquest our country had to be forced to surrender and to obey

We have been assailed by all the reactions since the inquisition, and they have raged in our country more furiously than in any other except Spain, until the Restoration. We have had to submit to the despotism of every power from Philip the second down to Napoleon. A cruel and long tyranny which ended by forcing us into servitude. During the time of our misery we learned habits of submission, from which these twenty years of socialist organisation have not been able to entirely free us.

"Soldiers and priests have long prepared our population for the masters of the factories. They pass without protest from one oppression to the other, and our Capitalist class have no trouble in controlling the workmen, who do not even murmur."

This is a strong and terrible statement, but I am not convinced that the conclusion is altogether just. The Belgians are a nation of revolt, however often it has been to no purpose. In the old days in Ghent the Mediaeval Guilds used to flock into the public square to raise their standard of revolt. And there also Gerard Denys used to lead the weavers against their oppressors. And there today is the Vooruit representing the modern revolt of the workers. The Walloons of Liège known always for their industry and hard labor, used to take the weapons, which they manufactured so skillfully, to use against their oppressors. A writer of the old day says, "The history of Liège records a series of sanguinary insurrections of the turbulent and unbridled populace against their oppressive and arrogant rulers."

And so it has always been. Belgium was perhaps the strongest section of the "Internationale", and the leaders were among the most capable and uncompromising. They were indefatigable in their labors to keep alive and to increase the spirit of revolt. Cesar De Paepe, Jean Pellerin, Désiré Brismée, Nicolas Coulon, Eugen Steens and Laurent Verrycken were men that any country might well be proud of. But unfortunately the "Internationale", although exhorting the workers to union and persistently urging that "the Emancipation of the workers must be the work of the workers themselves, "was a body controlled and dominated by intellectuals. It was filled with the poison of sectarian spirit. It was, despite all, ideological. The strife between the sects of intellectuals was constant and never ceasing. It was above all a continuous battle between two great intellects and the magnificent propaganda of years ended in separating and confusing the workers. They were dreary years of quarrels, which began by dividing and creating antagonisms among the workers and ended finally in the stagnation of the movement. Then came despair.

Some of the leaders began to believe with the Russians that the only hope left to them lay in pan-destruction. Others retired to their workshops hopelessly discouraged. Two "brilliant" members of the "Internationale" decided to interview Napoleon the third, who was then in England, and to endeavor to convert him to the wisdom of becoming the emperor of the workers and of the peasants. One of them became so enthusiastic about the matter that he soon imagined himself Vice-Emperor. To make clear his own novel idea he printed a little tract on "The Empire and the New France". Others of the leaders went into bourgeois politics having lost all hope of working class organisation. The

movement was dead and Capitalism in Belgium as elsewhere grew more arrogant and oppressive.

It was some time before new blood began to make itself felt. Two of the most remarkable of these youths came from among that wonderful people the weavers of Ghent. They were Van Beveren and Anseele. Other youths began to work in other parts of Belgium and pretty soon throughout the country new organisations began to arise. Workmen's Leagues, Democratic Federations, Political, Rational and Republican organisations began to spring up. Some of the old sections of the "Internationale" and the new Chamber of Labor were at work while in Ghent and elsewhere arose the Co-operative and Socialist organizations. Everywhere there came again to birth that old longing of the oppressed for unity and concerted action. With this spirit came again also leaders to give it voice; Jean Volders, Van Beveren, Anseele, Bertrand, old Cesar De Paepe and Verrycken.

Then in 1885 a hundred working men representing 59 groups came together in Brussels to discuss what they should do. It was a remarkable gathering and I had heard so much of it that I spent a long time trying to find a report of the proceedings. At another time I may perhaps go into the details of this remarkable conference which ended in the formation of the Belgian Labor Party. It will suffice here to say that to the thought of everyone the condition of the workers had become unbearable and the longing for unity amongst the working class was profound. They were sick of dogma and intellect and came very near excluding from the conference that grand old man, Cesar De Paepe. They gave no thought to program, and the socialists themselves with the exception of two or three agreed that it was better to leave the word "Socialist" out of the title of the party.

To my mind they had reached a stage more fundamentally revolutionary and more full of danger for capitalism than ever rested in any thought, any dogma, or in any statement of what the future society should be. They intended to unite a working class, no matter what the individuals believed or what the men were. And they wanted the stupid and backward elements as much as the advanced and more intelligent elements.

In this memorable year something more profound than doctrine agitated the souls of the workers and Unionists, Co-operators, Mutualists, Socialists, Democrats, Republicans, Rationalists, Catholics, Protestants, Revolutionists and Positivists came together and formed a class party. It was a union of oppressed against oppressors, a union of workers against capitalists, a union of exploited against exploiters. It was then, that they did precisely what they are now doing in England.

It was the birth of a clear-cut, class conscious, party, deter-

mined to free themselves from all political alliances or connection with capitalist parties. They did not say they were socialists, they simply said "the working class of Belgium is organizing itself politically against its exploiters", and that means in the end that they intend some day to take Belgium into their own hands and to administer it in their own interest. I will not say that some of the socialists were not dissatisfied, although they all freely and generously assented to the decision of the Congress. But whatever their opinion at that time it certainly came later in accord with that of Cesar De Paepe who wrote not long afterwards: "What more immense and at the same time more simple and precise! Why add the words Socialist, Collectivist, Communist, Rationalist, Democrat, Republican, and other limiting epithets. He who says *Parti Ouvrier* says Party of Class and since the working class constitute itself into a party how could you believe that it may be anything else in its tendencies and principles than socialist and republican?"

After the Belgian party was constituted it became the most strikingly solidified and integral party in Europe. Vandervelde has well said: "Belgian socialism, at the conflux of three great European Civilizations, partakes of the character of each of them. From the English it adopted the self help, the free association principally under the co-operative form; from the Germans the political tactics and the fundamental doctrines, which were for the first time exposed in the communist manifesto; and from the French they took their idealist tendencies, their integral conception of socialism, considered as the continuation of the revolutionary philosophy, and as a new religion continuing and fulfilling Christianity."

This is quite true. The Belgian Labor Party includes in itself every organization that expresses an aspiration of the working class. The Trade Unions, the Co-operatives with their "Houses of the People," their great stores and their public meeting halls; and the Friendly Societies with their Insurance schemes are all closely and definitely associated in one political party. This party has its press, its gigantic propaganda, its fighting force in Parliament and upon Municipal bodies. After the long years of division and of quarrels over doctrines it is not surprising that this organisation of the working class brought them hope for the future and for the present immense confidence in themselves.

During the following year in Belgium riots broke out in various industrial sections. The working class had long stood oppression and now at last it seemed the time had come to change the conditions of their existence. During all the years of capitalist domination the two old parties had ignored the necessities of the

poor. There was no legislation of any importance to benefit or protect the working class. The total disregard of the capitalists for the misery of the workers is shown by their treatment of a bill introduced in 1872 to regulate child labor. It was an effort to prevent little boys under 13 years of age and girls under 14 years of age from working underground in the coal mines. The bill was ignored for six years and only in 1878 did the Capitalist parties have time to consider it. And then even after the horrible conditions of child slavery had been stated, out of 155 representatives in Parliament 150 voted against the bill. But things began to change immediately after the formation of the Labor Party. The Capitalists were then forced to consider seriously the miserable condition of their working people. A commission of enquiry was established and a few years after 1886, law after law was voted for the benefit of the working class. Of course they were not important laws but, as I have shown in my recent paper on the British Movement, even these miserable concessions from the ruling powers were wrung from them only after a superb political revolt of the wage workers.

I have written so much of the earlier days of the Belgian Movement, because it is so significant. It seems to me also that it demonstrates the superiority of the class struggle over the mere belief in socialism or collectivism. There are many persons who call themselves socialists simply because they believe in Government ownership, or if you please the ownership by the people of certain or all forms of industry. Many of these socialists have believed in the past, and many even in the present day believe, that it is possible to convince a very considerable number of the propertied classes of the advantages of such collective ownership. Of course that was what Saint Simon, Fourier and Robert Owen thought. In all countries in the middle of last century there were men who believed that the advantages of socialism could be made so clear to every rational mind, that it only needed thorough statement to convince all mankind. There are some socialists today, many in the old political parties of every country who are in this sense convinced socialists.

It is perfectly possible I think for many sincere socialists to take this view. Indeed there are a large number of men in the socialist parties of Europe who still believe that socialism is solely an ideal for the future form of society. There are Fabians, Revisionists, and others who hold this view, including of course many who have left the party, because they have felt that they could as individuals do more effective work for socialism outside than inside the party. I shall not question the sincerity of such men such as John Burns, Millerand, Viviani and Briand, but in my opinion they are utopian socialists.

Opposed to this conception of socialism is the one held by those men who have believed that the most important work of all is the organisation of the workers. I mean such men as Liebknecht, De Paepe and Hardie. Certainly these three men have seen that the organisation of the workers against their exploiters is more important as a basis for a revolutionary organisation than the acceptance of a doctrine concerning the future organisation of society. For instance Liebknecht quarrelled with Marx because Liebknecht felt that the bringing of the working men of Germany together in a party was more important for the movement than the program. De Paepe in Belgium definitely urged the organisation of a class party and begged the other socialists who were there with him to give up for the time the pressing of the program. Hardie has more recently done the same in England. These striking examples of great political leadership are significant for us in America at this moment, because we may have a similar situation to deal with.

It is unnecessary to point out that the line of action spoken of above is not in any sense opportunism. Opportunism has become in party parlance almost a technical word. It means approaching nearer to the capitalist parties; it means affiliation, joint action, *blocs* and similar arrangements with capitalist parties for the purpose of getting specific legislation or other benefits. The action which Liebknecht, Hardie and De Paepe took is the exact contrary. It deals a death blow to the old political parties. It means finally their destruction and annihilation; it means teaching the working class self respect and demonstrating to them their tremendous power; it means uniting them; it means taking them in masses from the old parties and teaching them, perhaps not so much to know the value to them of socialism, but certainly to realize their gigantic power as a class; it means drawing the lines of battle; it means teaching loyalty to a class and gives meaning to the word traitor; it means showing to the working class that whatever they want they can have if they will but unite themselves. In other words opportunism means sacrificing the clear and definite lines of the class movement for the sake of some benefit, perhaps in itself extremely important, for the welfare of the working classes. The other line of action means not pressing for the moment the final aim, in order that the working classes may be united and taught the enormous value of solidarity. I may not perhaps make this tactic entirely clear and if I have not, I shall be glad, if questioned, to write on the subject more fully at another time. I speak so much of it at this time only because during the last few months, since giving special attention to the formation of the English, Belgian and German Movements I have felt increasingly the importance of these tactics.

ROBERT HUNTER.

The Conditions of Living Among the Poor.

SOME talented writer, I think it is Jacobs, in an article published recently in some magazine, I think *The American*, introduces to us a newly discovered specimen of genus Americans the "Middle American" type. He ranges us all, the fifteen odd millions American families, in a row, according to the visible and tangible means of subsistence of each family, placing at one end the billionaire families and coming down to the other end with the lowest dregs of the submerged ten million. After having stood us all up in a nice row, he comes up to the middle of the row and picks out the middle family. The head of this family is the "Middle American". Mr. Jacobs then proceeds to show the place of this "Middle American" in the scheme of creation. The social status of the specimen is illumined by the fanciful genius of the author. He finds that the object of his research is ever rubbing elbows with poverty, and manages only by dint of incessant toil and drudgery to maintain his place on the ragged edge of existence. The author is consoled by the thought of the seven and one half million families whose position ever improves in the ascending scale, but he is appalled that there are as many families whose fate is getting ever worse as it is further removed from the "Middle American," till the very lowest pit of poverty and degradation is reached. The picture is striking and fanciful, but a prosaic mind finds it difficult to discern its outlines in real life.

Being of that disposition, I was much more impressed by the plain, matter of fact way in which Mr. S. E. Forman deals with the same subject in his article entitled "Conditions of Living Among the Poor" which was published in the *Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor* for May, 1906. The article bears the marks of painstaking labor and industrious research. It is my purpose to exhume some of the facts from the *Bulletin* and give them another chance for life.

The author set out to find out how the poor live, not from books or reports, but by going to the poor and asking them to tell him all about it.

The inquiry was made in Washington, D. C., and all the poor whose manner of living he studied were residing in the shadow of our national prosperity mill—the Republican Congress, Executive and Supreme Court. The author "operated" on 19 families, all of them average working class families. Says the author:

"The article does not give an account of the living conditions which prevail among paupers or among those who have reached the lowest stages of destitution. It is impossible to secure accurate statements of household expenses from families wholly submerged by poverty."

The author reduces the 19 human tragedies to 105 pages packed closely with facts and figures. Rather dry. All the more the pity that men who know how, have not turned these facts and figures into "copy" as printable in the daily press and as readable by the workingmen as a murder trial or baseball report. Out of the 19, we shall take 3 families and let Mr. Forman introduce them to you:

"Family No. 1.—Ten in family—husband, wife and aged aunt and seven children of the following ages: 8, 6, 5, 4, (twins,) 2, 5 months. The husband about 30 years of age, is the only wage earner and is a coal heaver. His income varies from \$9 to \$12 a week. Food consuming power, 5.45 adult males. Occupy a two-story four-room frame building in the neighborhood of the gas works. The rooms are of medium size. The house has no conveniences, and water is brought from a distance. Bath house and surroundings are unsanitary. Rent \$8.50 a month."

"Family No. 6.—Seven in family—widow and six children of the following ages: 16, 14, 12, 9, 7, 2. The mother is a char-woman in the service of the Government. Her regular wages are \$20 a month, but her hours of labor permit her to earn some extra money in private families. Boy also works and brings in several dollars a week, but amount is irregular. Food-consuming power, 5.25 adult males. Occupy a small two-story frame building with four rooms of medium size, located on the outskirts. The house is not kept in repair and is unsanitary. Rent, \$5 a month."

"Family No. 15.—Six in family—husband, wife, and four children of the following ages: 11, 8, 6, and a baby. The husband, a young man, is the only wage-earner and is a tinner. His wages are \$2.50 a day but he finds it impossible to get regular work. Food-consuming power 4.1 adult males. Occupy a two-story building of four rooms very unfavorably located. The house is in a shamefully dilapidated condition and is so insanitary as to be a disgrace. Water is brought from a distance. Rent, \$5 a month."

"An examination of the above details shows that the report deals with a normal and with a very large segment of society. The people, the intimate facts of whose domestic economy are herein set forth are representative of the thousands of other people in the District. Taking the country over they are representative of millions of honest industrious citizens who help to make the world around us the pleasant place it is."

The inquiry covered five weeks, 3 weeks in the summer and 2 weeks in the winter. It included the entire household budget of each family, as, food, rent, clothing, fuel, furniture, insurance, miscellaneous. We will examine each item separately.

Food.—Obviously the most important element in the family budget of the poor is the food element, says the author. We should therefore expect to find that element constant and stable. We find it instead fluctuating from week to week. In family No. 1 for instance, the food expenses for 5 weeks are \$5.31, \$5.77, \$8.60, \$7.39, \$8.57. The author proceeds to show the reasons.

"What is the explanation of these great differences in food expenditure? How can the fact be accounted for that family No. 1, for example, spent \$5.31 for food in the first week of the investigation and \$8.57 during the last week? In this instance the explanation is the very simple one that in the first week the wage-earner was idle about half the time; while in the last week he was employed every day. In the case of family No. 2, why was there a fall from \$5.86 in the second week to \$3.91 in the third week? Because in the third week the rent fell due. Why in the budget of family No. 3 is there the great difference between \$6.77 in the first week and \$2.45 in the last week? Because in the last week the rent had to be paid and a payment of \$6 upon an old debt had to be made, and furthermore the wage-earner was idle part of the time. Thus we might go through the accounts of every family and find that any considerable decrease in food expenditures was almost always due to the payment of rent or some financial stress of the week."

The range of diet among these families is very limited. It is confined to a few articles, as, bread, meat, potatoes, coffee and tea. These are the staples.

It was found that nearly 25 per cent of the total expenditures of all families or nearly 60 per cent of the food expenditures, was for bread and meat. Stale bread is largely used and of the meats only the cheap varieties of beef stew, sausage etc. are accessible to the poor. Only 5 families occasionally indulge in eggs. Milk is used irregularly, in some cases scarcely at all, and many families lead weeks of butterless existence. Some of the families buy no fruit of any kind and the average weekly expenditure for fruit per adult male is 2 cents. The "adult male" is the standard by which the consuming power of a family is measured and means more than merely a person. So for family No. 1 of 10 persons the consuming power is given as 5.45. The average daily food expenditure per adult male ranges from 10 cents a day in family No. 4 to 26 cents a day in family No. 12. The per cent of food expenditure of the total expenditures ranges from 33 per cent to 69.3 per cent.

"The greater part of the earnings of the poor," says the author, "is expended for something to put into the stomach."

The investigator found only in 13 families the use of tobacco and in 2 families only did the expenditures exceed a dollar for the five weeks.

Says Mr. Forman:—"Beer and whiskey practically do not appear in the budget at all. The almost complete absence of these articles is due to the fact that families in which intoxicants were habitually used were avoided in making this investigation."

The temperance apostle and the other of rolling-the-eyes-heavenward, holier-than-thou fraternity may take a leaf from here. Here are 19 American families belonging to the working class, selected by the investigator especially for their industry, regularity and sobriety. The investigator is compelled to note the fact of *actual starvation* among them. Let him speak for himself:

"An examination of the food expenditures in the detail indicates plainly that the fluctuations in food expenditure mean great difference in actual nourishment and that during those weeks when expenditures were lowest there was not enough to eat. In a number of the families it is plain that the food purchased was at no time sufficient to provide proper nourishment. In nearly all of the 19 families there are appearances at times of excessive and injurious economy in food purchases, and in most, but not in all, of the cases in which this economy is excessive it is enforced."

It is useless to point again to the savings banks' deposits as a sign of prosperity of the working class; or to the expenditure of the working class for liquor. While the figures of the savings banks deposits and of the nations budget for liquor are formidable the pangs of hunger, the drawn faces of slow starvation pass unrecorded. No statistician has as yet reduced to figures and tables the famine that ever preys on the men and women who toil. Good times may come to them who are now famishing. But there can be no compensation for pains once felt. For all his vileness and malignity Mugridge in Jack London's *Sea-wolf* has sounded the deeps of this great wrong:

"If I was President of the United States to-morrer, 'ow would it fill my belly for one time w'en I was a kiddy and it went empty?"

RENT—Mr. Forman finds that in the food budget there is a minimum below which nature will punish want of nourishment by impairing the human machine. Not so in rent. Says the author:

"There seems to be no house too cheap, no structure with too small a rental value, to prevent its being used as the habitation of human beings. In the downward march of poverty, therefore the

descent in housing conditions continues long after food conditions have reached their lowest point."

The rent ranges from \$4 to \$14 a month for 3 to 5 rooms. In one case the rent is \$3, but the housewife is caretaker of the premises and the rent is only nominal. In one case the family owns the house, which is mortgaged to its full value and the interest and water rate amounted to \$6.35 a month which is a virtual rental.

"An examination of the descriptions of the houses occupied by these 19 families will give a pretty correct notion of the housing conditions which prevail among the poor, for almost every house described is matched by tens, sometimes by hundreds, of houses around it. The examination discloses the fact that many of the conveniences known as modern are not shared by the poor. In none of the houses is there a bath tub, and in but one is there running water. In a large number of cases water has to be brought so far as to prevent it from being brought at all in quantities adequate for cleanliness. Gas is supplied to but one house (No. 18) and in this instance by means of a slot device instead of by a regular meter. A quarter of a dollar is dropped in the slot and a certain amount of gas metered out. When the amount is consumed, the gas is instantly shut off. Most of the houses are so small as to preclude the idea of privacy and some are crowded beyond the point of decency. The location of most of the houses is very undesirable and often very inconvenient. It will be noticed that many of the families seek the outskirts of the city. This is of course to save rent. But this economy is to some extent delusive. In the remote suburbs there are extra expenses for car fare, especially for the wage-earner. The prices of necessities in the outskirts are higher than they are in the center of the city. The grocer in the suburbs usually charges more for flour and sugar and the coal dealer ordinarily adds 25 cents or 50 cents to the price of a ton of coal when he sells it to customers several miles away. The sanitary conditions of the houses of these poor are seen from the description to be almost uniformly bad."

It is found that the poor pay a higher rent on the market value of the property than the well-to-do. For instance, on the basis of 10 per cent. profit on the market value of the property, which is considered a good return on high class of property, family No. 1 should have paid \$3.50 a month rent. In fact it paid \$8.50 a month rent. In rent, as in other things, the poor get less value dollar per dollar than the well-to-do.

CLOTHING—It stands to reason that a five weeks budget will give no adequate data on expenditure for clothes. The investigator found it impossible to give figures. For one reason because in many instances there was almost nothing to report. The poor

get their clothes in a way which would elude all statistical reports: prosperous relatives, churches, charities, rummage sales are the sources of supply. It seems that a piece of clothing is never too worn out so that it cannot be patched and worn again. There is however one item which cannot be avoided. This is shoes.

"A hat or a skirt or a coat may be worn for almost a generation, but shoes soon wear out and must be replaced and cash is required for the replacement. It is 'shoes, shoes, shoes' with the very poor as it is with those in better circumstances."

"A true conception of clothing conditions in these families can be acquired only by visiting the homes. In some of the families the husband although a regular wage-earner, has no 'best suit' and the wife no 'best dress'. What is worn on week days must be worn on Sundays as well. In such cases church-going and visiting are considered out of the question. In several instances the children are not permitted to go to school because they are not properly clad. In five of the families (Nos. 1, 3, 5, 15, and 17) fathers, mothers, and children are so poorly clad that it is difficult to see how they maintain their self-respect."

FUEL—The sources of fuel supply of the poor are various and precarious. The husband brings home now an old railroad tie, now a pocketful of coal picked up near the tracks. One family exploited the ash heaps located near the house. Husband and children would devote their Sundays to digging in the ash heaps. Such haphazard supply may be sufficient for cooking purposes. When the cold weather comes, the fuel must be bought. The poor buy coal by the peck or bushel and pay from 40 to 50 per cent. more than if they could have purchased it by the ton. Only one fire is kept and the family huddle together in the kitchen.

"When fuel is purchased at such ruinous prices it is not to be expected that the heating will be ample. The bucket of coal or the sack of coke is very precious and is made to last longer than is consistent with comfort. In several of the houses during cold weather there was only enough fire to take the chill from the atmosphere. In very few of them was there a comfortable degree of warmth."

FURNITURE—18 out of 19 families buy their furniture on the installment plan. The nineteenth family buys no furniture at all. Only the absolutely indispensable articles are bought, as stoves, bedclothes, etc.

"The installment plan does not suffice to give the poor well-furnished homes. Three of the 19 houses were furnished sufficiently well to produce a homelike appearance. In the others there was little but the remains of the outfits purchased years before at the time of marriage. Occasionally a cheap and gaudy

rug or a highly varnished rocking chair emphasizes by way of painful contrast the general dilapidation."

INSURANCE—It seems that among the poor every one, except infants under 1 year of age, is insured. Out of 124 persons in the 19 families 119 were insured. The others were infants. The insurance is all "industrial" which means that the poor pay two or three times as much for insurance as the well-to-do. The amounts of weekly payments range from 10 cents to \$1.17 a week. The object of insurance is one only.

"The dread of 'potter's field' is always present in the minds of the poor. 'I would rather stint them (the children) a little in food,' one mother said, 'and pay my insurance for then if anything happens to them there will be a place to put them.' Burial money, that is the be-all and end-all of insurance among the poor. Very seldom is there anything left after the undertaker has been paid and the cemetery expenses discharged. The little weekly premiums are not investments, are not hoardings, but are a pious provision for decency and propriety in the hour and article of death. And herein is seen the real significance of the insurance element among the poor. History teaches that the institution of insurance as it is regarded by the poor is as old as society and the facts of the budget are illustrations of the truth that insurance is a fundamental necessity of the social relation."

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES—The miscellaneous expenses of the poor remind one of the snakes in Ireland. There are none. Amusements,—no expenditure; not one cent for 19 families. Newspapers,—two of the 19 families occasionally receive a penny paper. For physicians and medicines in case of sickness the poor must resort to charity.

The installment system forms an important part of the economy of the poor. Everything is bought on installment plan. And even rent and food are paid on this plan. The result is that the family is always in debt and there is little sense of property in anything. Things may be carried off for non-payment. The investigator finds this extremely demoralizing. But he admits that he sees no other way.

"Many of the very poor families who buy regularly on the installment plan do succeed in surrounding themselves with a few, at least, of the comforts of life, while with few exceptions those families who buy nothing or very little in that way live under conditions too bad to be justified by any economic or social theory. 'I know as well as anybody,' said a widow who was paying for a stove by installments, 'that I will pay more for the stove than it is worth, but I would rather do that than freeze, and I am glad that I can get it on the installment plan.'"

The investigation showed that irregularity of employment is

the greatest curse of the poor. In one family the husband receives \$1.50 a day regularly. It manages to get along better than another family whose wage-earner gets \$3.00 a day, but is frequently laid off. With the poor regularity of employment is of more importance than the rate of wages.

The investigator devoted a long chapter to show the losses which the poor sustain in making their purchases in small quantities, and day by day and even meal by meal. The extreme hardships under which the poor borrow are shown in great detail. A computation upon figures furnished to an applicant by 15 loan companies of the District showed that the rate of interest actually charged ranges from 138 to 221 per cent. per annum. The investigator verified these figures by actual transaction and found that the rate of interest amounted in one case to 244 per cent. per annum.

It is worth while reiterating that the above is not from a report of some charity institution. It is a report of an investigator of the Federal government, published by the government. It deals not with paupers or the very poor who are regular objects of charity, but with the average American workingman's family. The investigation was made at the time when using the many times reiterated phrase of President Roosevelt, "the country was enjoying a period of unparalleled prosperity". The American working men have shown the most profound and abiding faith in President Roosevelt. It behooves us, therefore, to take his words to heart and ponder over them earnestly. We do so. We consider that the conditions under which the average American workingman lives are intolerable and almost appalling. But we are aware that the American workingman is satisfied that he is prosperous. We confess that we are non-plussed. And we ask: Are the American workingmen too poor, or are they not poor enough to revolt?

HENRY L. SLOBODIN.

The Intellectuals and Working Class Socialism.

THE struggle now in progress between the trade union socialism of the laborers and the democratic socialism of the intellectuals might be likened to an actual class struggle if it were not an abuse of terms to give the name of class to the group of professional thinkers. But this analogy, false in itself, would at least have the merit of indicating the opposition of interests and ideas which lines up on one side, the socialism of political parties, and on the other, the socialism of working-class institutions.

It would be difficult to think of a more distinct antithesis, on the one side the working-class arrived at self-consciousness resolves to emancipate itself by its own creations: its efforts are thus necessarily directed against the modern hierarchy embodied in the state and its disputing parties. On the other, the mass of the intellectuals from whom are drawn the officials of all factions who carry on the state have a tendency on the contrary to increase the part played by government, to enlarge the scope of state institutions and to extend the directing function of parties. These are thus two movements which go on in opposite directions in proportion as the conquest of public powers stands opposed to the dismantling of the state and the autonomy of the labor movement to the preponderance of parties under socialism.

We are thus in the presence of two categories of interests and of contradictory ideas. This separation stands out clearly only in countries where democracy is fully realized. Classes do not clash brutally until the day when their antagonisms cease to be veiled by a common struggle for political rights, but wherever democracy is still to be won, intellectuals and laborers find themselves more or less confounded in the common struggle for liberty. The democratic thesis precedes the working-class antithesis.

As France is of all countries the one which presents most clearly the classic type of democracy, it is in France more than anywhere else that we can trace the relations of the intellectuals and the proletariat in socialism. Of course, the knowledge of the experience of France will not give mechanically the key to what is passing in other countries. It is evident that conclusions which are good for a given environment cannot be carried

over just as they are to a different environment but it is none the less true that every social experiment contains the sum-total of lessons which can be utilized when it is reproduced under conditions slightly dissimilar.

Again the examination of the problem admits a sum-total of general considerations: of these what is especially happening in France is merely the most concrete illustration.

I

PROLETARIAT, INTELLECTUALS, SOCIALISM.

I.—The problem has to start out with a precise notion of socialism. Our explanations can have no bearing unless we confess socialism as summed up entirely in the struggle of the working-class. From this point of view we need not insist at length on the fact that the labor movement is the backbone of the modern historical movement. Marxian criticism has sufficiently established that it is the proletariat which makes history. Placed at the heart of production, that is to say, at the center of society, it sustains on its shoulders the capitalist world and the least of its movements imparts repeated vibrations to the whole social body. Itself the product of industrial evolution, it precedes all other classes on the road of the future and impresses its rhythm on the march of history.

The proletariat is truly the only revolutionary class as much from the negative point of view as the positive. It destroys and builds while fighting; while it ruins the bourgeois institutions and ideology. And it is this double activity, the negation of capitalism and the elaboration of socialism which constitutes its mission.

It is easy to see how the proletariat is in the first place the one force to destroy the bourgeois order. Of all classes this alone is irreconcilably opposed in its interests to capitalist society. All other suffering classes like the peasants or the small capitalists can to a greater or less extent enter into treaty with a social system founded on individual property in the means of production. But the working-class could find there no stable footing nor convenient place. The proletariat considered as a whole, is by its very make-up condemned in the schedules of the capitalist world to keep to its double role of producing class and exploited class without hope of deliverance. Some few of its members may free themselves separately, the mass is clamped to its chain. This is another way of saying that the maintenance of capitalist society is incompatible with the freeing of the proletariat.

Every attempt at the liberation of the working-class whose aim is not to overthrow capitalism from summit to foundation is therefore destined to be but a vain labor of Sisyphus. The

producing class will be delivered from oppression only by a complete social transformation which shall substitute common property for individual property in the means of labor. That is what is meant by the "class struggle." Remember Marx's phrase, "It is the bad side of history which makes history." It is only the classes that are oppressed by a certain system which can destroy it and replace it by a new system and thus it is that in present society the proletariat is really the only class in a position to be permanently revolutionary.

But it is also the only organic force that is capable of shaping the new order. If the class of producers pursues as its final aim the common appropriation of the means of production, it centers all its efforts on the practical activity which constitutes its *movement*. Not only does it struggle to modify to its advantage the existing economic, legal and political relations but above all it organizes itself into groups of a very definite character and it creates institutions and ideas which are suited to it. Upon its unions, its federations of unions, its labor exchanges, its organizations of every kind the proletariat centers itself more and more, borrowing nothing but from itself and hoping nothing but from its strength alone.

Thus from day to day it withdraws more and more from the capitalist system and forms little by little a labor State within the capitalist State. And it is because it thus develops within itself a new organization and new ideas independent of the traditional organization and ideas, and opposed to them; it is because within itself different forms of life, independent economic institutions with their appropriate legal and moral systems are progressively shaping themselves, — it is because of all this that it can make possible the formation of a socialist society. It may thus fairly be said that the working-class carries within itself the new *economic man* and *moral man*.

This explains why socialism blends with the labor movement in the class struggle. None but the intellectuals of democracy regard socialism as the product of philosophical or ideological conceptions or again as the progressive development of state institutions.

Working-class socialism is a *philosophy of producers*. It conceives itself as related only to the world of production. It is born in the workshop, in the strike, in the union, in the labor exchange. It springs from the revolt and organization of the proletariat struggling for the new law which shall regulate a society *without masters* and *without parasites*.

But precisely because it is the beginning and end of socialism the labor movement of the class struggle must secure itself against the influx of any corrupting elements. Now the greatest danger which threatens it is that the ditch which it is digging

more and more between capitalism and itself may be filled up by those very persons who outside its ranks are setting forth the claims of socialism. And the mass of the intellectuals sated with political power, sinecures and official positions stand in the front rank of these dangerous "recruits."

2.—What are we to understand by intellectuals? It is a vague expression the content of which is difficult to define because it applies to widely different categories of individuals who cannot be brought under a common definition. But what we actually include under this term is all the people who make a profession of thinking and derive profit from it. They come from strata where some little culture is developed; where, for example, a high school or college education is the usual thing and from which (this is important) the liberal professions are recruited:—the lawyers, judges, doctors, engineers, professors, officials, journalists, writers, etc. With these may also be included certain employees, the teachers, etc., in a word all those whose practical and paid activity is of an order distinctly cerebral: it is in this sense that the term intellectual is opposed to the term manual. We are perfectly well aware that this distinction between intellectual and manual labor has no physiological nor experimental basis. In manual labor every intellectual effort does not disappear and many labors which are called intellectual are not so at all, but this distinction has been historically given us by the development of modern production. Marx has pointed out this process.

The great mechanical industry, he says, works a separation between manual labor and the intellectual forces of production which it transforms into the power of capital over labor. This separation of laborers into intellectual and manual is thus at the base of the current social hierarchy. It is the support of the division into superiors and inferiors, into governors and governed.

It is understood that this division of brain activity and physical activity has made the exercise of both alike into a trade. Whether we consider the trade of an intellectual to be inferior or superior to the trades of practical life, it is none the less an industry, the *industry of thought*. *Intellectual* does not mean *intelligent* and *mental worker* does not necessarily mean *thinker*. The ruling characteristic of the intellectuals is the heterogeneity of the groupings within which they are subdivided. The lawyer and the inventor, the doctor and professor, the chemist and the journalist have professional interests and not class interests. In a study which appeared in 1895 on "Socialism and the Intellectuals," Kautsky pointed out this very thing. The intellectuals are divided into very different categories, into very exclusive coteries, and they are not united within each of these

subdivisions by any bond except one analogous to that of the old time guild and even in each category the professional interests of the individuals composing it are far from being alike. The situation of a poor devil of a journalist with 150 or 200 francs a month has nothing in common with the situation of an editor-in-chief with a monthly salary of 1,000 or 2,000 francs. It will thus be seen how inaccurate it is to speak of a *class* of intellectuals. A class is a category of men placed on the same economic plane and united by homogeneous material and moral interests. The thing that defines a class is the inner solidarity which welds its members one to another on a permanent basis at once economic and moral. We may say the class of landed proprietors, the class of capitalists, the class of proletarians because these social categories rest on definite economic phenomena and common material and moral interests. Rent and the growth of rent; profit and the increase of profit; wages and the raising of wages. There is nothing like this with the intellectuals. They do not form a group and they have no struggles strictly in common. They do not constitute a class for *themselves*. They exist only for the other classes. Having neither homogeneous life nor ideology of their own, the intellectuals defend the interests and ideas of the classes or the parties to which they adhere. They thus play merely the part of auxiliaries. They are what Marx calls the ideological representatives of the classes into which they are incorporated.* Scattered through the different social strata putting themselves at their service; borrowing their conceptions; working up ideas for them; how could they be united by any effective bond of solidarity. That is why there exists among them more furiously than within any other social category a jealous competition, a fierce rivalry, a spirit of exasperated intrigue. They must sell at any price their intellectual ability, their only commodity, their only security. And the market for ideas is so glutted! So it is only by an abuse of terms that we sometimes say the class of intellectuals. *Sub-class* would be more suitable or better still *out-of-class*.

Historically the intellectuals have played a foremost part in the development of political society. We do not mean to speak especially of the historical influence exerted by ideology. It is undeniable that while interpreting reality the work of the mind reacts upon the reality itself. Engels in his famous letters on historical materialism was himself obliged to insist at some length

* "What makes democrats of the representatives of the little capitalists is the fact that their brains cannot outgrow the limits which the little capitalist himself cannot transcend in his living. The former are thus brought theoretically to the same problems and the same solutions which their material interest and social situation impose upon the latter. Such is moreover in general the bond which unites political and literary representatives of a class to the class which they represent." Karl Marx. The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.

upon this fact and it is from this point of view that the action of ideology and ideologists is found everywhere in history. Who could question the influence of the legal and moral systems which were successively the work of the monks of the Church in the middle ages; the civilians of royalty; the jurists of the French Revolution.

But that is not the question. It is of the political role of the intellectuals that we wish to speak. M. Ferrero, in one of the best pages of his history of Rome, in which he pictures the eminent role of Cicero, has well defined the place held in political history by professional thinkers. He (Cicero) was, M. Ferrero says, the first statesman belonging to the class of intellectuals and consequently the head of a dynasty as corrupt, vicious and mischievous as you please, but which the historian though he detests it must recognize as having lasted longer than that of the Caesars; for from Cicero's time to ours it has never ceased through twenty centuries to dominate Europe. Cicero was the first of those knights of the pen who all through the history of our civilization have been sometime the props of the state and sometimes the artisans of the revolution: orators, jurisconsults, polygraphs in the Pagan Empire; afterwards defenders and fathers of the church; monks, civilians, theologians, doctors and lecturers in the middle ages; humanists in the time of the Renaissance; encyclopedists in France in the eighteenth century and in our days lawyers, journalists, public men and professors.

In the course of time it is only the condition of the intellectuals which is changed, formerly artistic and privileged the lettered class has seen its independence diminish in proportion as the capitalist mode of production has developed. This evolution is easy to follow.

It is no exaggeration to say that the church preceding democracy on this route had created one of the most perfect governments of intellectuals. Its clergy had organized the most methodical domination that could be imagined of a body of lettered men over the mass of the people. But it was also the professionals of thought who, constituting a new clergy, the lay clergy, emancipated the civil society from religious society and arrayed against the latter a rival government. The bourgeoisie effected its revolution with the aid of these intellectuals; men of law and letters, advocates, magistrates, professors, journalists who arose from the third estate and interpreted its class aspirations. At such times when the capitalist class is engaged in ruining the old social forms and preparing its political future, the intellectuals are not attached to society by virtue of a special function but are bound up with its general development. Having no positive economic interests, finding themselves above and outside social conflicts, separated from the bourgeois class by a

throng of intermediaries, they defend the general interest of society. In the struggle waged against the ruling forces they represent the critical spirit. Their chief function is to destroy the authority which is at the base of the old regime. They overthrow tradition and thus favor especially the triumph of the bourgeoisie.

But once the bourgeoisie has become master of the situation antagonisms arise between the newly triumphant class and the intellectuals; the intermediaries which separated them (that is to say the adverse forces to be fought) having been eliminated by historical evolution, the bourgeoisie and intellectuals come to face each other. Their relations change rapidly and in proportion as the oppositions between capital and labor become accentuated the category of the intellectuals become more and more dependent upon the capitalist class. Relieved of its other cares, the bourgeoisie turns its whole attention to these class oppositions and endeavors to solve them to its profit. The intellectuals become its men of all work. It had required literary men to establish its rule. It still requires them to maintain it. More and more it shifts all its responsibility for thinking and governing upon the category of the intellectuals and develops this type to a prodigious extent. Special capacities of every sort, engineers, chemists, agricultural experts, etc., are created in a continuous stream according to the multiplied exigencies of industrial evolution. Meanwhile the state grows fat, the public and private administrations enlarge, the bureaucracy grows, public instruction is organized, journalism is extended; all so many causes of a prodigious awakening of intellectual forces.

But along with all this overproduction of capacities the capitalist system degrades thought, reduces it to the state of merchandise subject to the law of supply and demand. The intellectuals are no longer anything more than Phrasemongers in the exact sense of the word. Disinterested research, the independent productions of literature, art and science, for these the bourgeoisie has no care. It requires from its domestics of the pen the fabrication of the intellectual product which suits its taste and is on its level and it is well known what this taste and this level are. The inferior scientific, artistic and literary products which flood the market are an accurate gauge of the intellectual aspirations of the ruling classes.

The overproduction of these literary men whom the capitalist system supports in this fashion leads to a lowering of their salaries. The number of those unemployed or crowded out is constantly increasing and the competition among them is becoming disastrous. Then begins the formation of what is very improperly called the intellectual proletariat. Surely the distinctive mark of the proletarian is to be inevitably bound by the very

conditions of production to his precarious and inevitably miserable state without the possibility of emerging from it to establish himself permanently in bourgeois society. We may perhaps say that the unemployed or exploited members of the category of intellectuals are in a situation which suggests that of the laborers but this is only at times when they are unemployed or exploited and this characteristic is shared with them by many other strata of society none of which has any greater resemblance to the proletariat. Moreover the intellectuals are or may be only momentarily in unfortunate circumstances. At the worst they have the hope of emerging from them.

The objection is raised that the uninterrupted formation of intellectual capacities tends to maintain an always increasing portion of them in this miserable situation bordering on that of the proletariat. Their salaries are falling to such a level of wretchedness that it is no longer merely when they are not working that the poor intellectuals are unfortunate. It is also when they are working.

No doubt; yet however pitiable may be the lot of the poor intellectual, and it is often lamentable, these exterior similarities do not go deep enough. There is an essential and irreducible difference which prevails over all the analogies which may be suggested by their state of insecurity. It turns on the quality of producers which is characteristic of the laborers, and the quality of non-producers, which is the specific mark of the intellectuals. The former are the active agents of society. The latter are only its parasites.

But whence come these intellectuals whom the economic, political and administrative exigencies of social life call forth in constantly increasing number. Apart from their natural increase they come especially from the little capitalists and from rural neighborhoods. It is a phenomenon which Kautsky clearly pointed out in the article we have mentioned and to which he often returned in his book against Bernstein. "There is forming," he wrote, "a new and very numerous class constantly increasing and whose increase may under certain circumstances make up for the losses which the decadence of small industry and trade are causing the middle class to suffer." The movement is so general that it may be said that there is no country where the small capitalists and peasants do not push their sons into intellectual positions mediocre but permanent and apparently brilliant.

If then we try to locate the group of intellectuals in the system of capitalist production we discover that it is not linked directly to the division of society into classes but rather to the system itself considered as a whole. It is only in indirect fashion

that these intermediaries tend to take a position in the general schedule of classes.

This situation has given them a peculiar psychology and it is this psychology common to most of the intellectuals which enable us to unite them into one and the same category. The literary caste, the thinking caste, by the mere fact that it receives a privileged education and higher instruction easily imagines that it is independent of social conflicts, that it represents the general interests of society, that it constitutes an intellectual aristocracy. The professional thinker assumes to solve everything by the light of Reason (his reason) and of the Idea (his idea). He reduces everything to questions of reasoning in which, he is past master. (The self-sufficiency and intolerance of the new college graduate are proverbial. He regards himself the trustee of the wisdom of the world. Experience goes to show that most of the intellectuals have more or less contempt for manual laborers and easily believe themselves the quickest to understand everything, the most capable to govern everything, the worthiest to direct everything,

"Work to the laborers,
Power to the cultivated people."

This is their understanding of the social hierarchy. Is it not a French publicist, Henry Beranger, who in a characteristic and pretentious book *Intellectual Aristocracy* set forth the claims of the intellectuals to the dictatorship of the world?

They have tradition on their side; the state has long been in the hands of professional politicians; it is the instrument of their industry; it permits them either to impose their ideas by force or to serve their own interests or do both at once. The ruling classes absorbed in production and exchange take these clerks into their pay to rule to their advantage. The intellectual is arrogant only when it is a question of how his merits should be estimated; in the presence of his masters he has no back bone and he carries out the policy which they direct. Sorel arrived at an exact definition of the state as "A group of personages exploiting the privileged classes and giving them in exchange the power to exploit the laboring classes." It is certain that the talents thus employed cost the bourgeoisie dearly and that political parasitism is a heavy load on capitalism.

Jaures in a recent eulogy on democracy said that it was a "dear government." He meant that we should not regret this continued increase of governmental expenses necessitated by the increasing extension of function. It is plain that the "capacities" in charge of the operation of the state and its public administrations will never consider that they are paid in proportion to their value. "Talents" can never appraise themselves high enough.

Politics which is simply the exploitation of the state by those in charge, is thus the vocation of the intellectuals. In this sense they indeed form a distant caste which is separated from society in order better to exercise its brigandage at society's expense. However much political factions may fight each other they have a strong resemblance. The intellectuals constitute at once their general staff and their constituency and their universal aim is to conquer the state in order to pillage it. It is very essential that the governors live off the governed.

HUBERT LAGARDELLE, Paris.

(Translated by Charles H. Kerr.)

(To be continued.)

EDITORIAL NOTE.

It is well in reading this exceedingly clever presentation of one phase of the "syndicalist" movement, that is now playing so great a part in Europe to remember that "intellectuals" may juggle phrases in support of "syndicalism" as well as of capitalism or socialism, that assertion of the functionless character of these "intellectuals" does not alter the fact that they are still playing an important role in just that scientific and mechanical development from which socialism proceeds, and finally that the mere fact that Lagardelle, Arturo Labrioda, and indeed practically all the "syndicalist" writers, spokesmen and leaders are members of this same despised class of "intellectuals," and this to an even greater extent than the "parliamentarians" at whom they hurl such fine scorn, should not prejudice us too strongly against giving ear to what they have to say.

The Biogenetic Law.

It is very easy to go too far in drawing analogies between biology and sociology. Society—as yet, at least—is not an organism in the sense that a tree or a mammal is. It is quite true that with the perfect organization and solidarity to which Socialists look forward the analogy will be more complete than it is to-day, but for the present we must always remember that, as the lawyers would say, “the cases are not on all fours.” If we bear these reservations in mind laws drawn from natural science are often of the greatest aid in enabling us to understand the phenomena of psychology and sociology.

One of the most helpful of these laws of science is the biogenetic law which is always associated with the great name of Ernest Haeckel, its most distinguished exponent. Doctor William Bölsche, in his book* on Haeckel, uses, to illustrate this law, the familiar example of the frog. The mother frog lays her eggs in the water. In due course a new frog develops from each of these eggs. But the object that develops from them is altogether different from the adult frog. This object is the familiar fish-like tadpole. It finally loses its tail, develops legs, and becomes a frog. Doctor Bölsche discusses the matter as follows:—

“There are reasons on every hand for believing that the frogs and salamanders, which now stand higher in classification than the fishes, were developed from the fishes in earlier ages in the course of progressive evolution. Once upon a time they were fishes. If that is so, the curious phenomenon we have been considering really means that each young frog resembles its fish ancestors. In each case to-day the frog’s egg first produces the earlier or ancestral stage, the fish, it then develops rapidly into a frog. In other words, the individual development recapitulates an important chapter of the earlier history of the whole race of frogs. Putting this in the form of a law, it runs: each new individual must, in its development, pass rapidly through the form of its parents’ ancestors before it assumes the parent form itself. If a new individual frog is to be developed and if the ancestors of the whole frog stem were fishes, the first thing to develop from the frog’s egg will be a fish and it will only later assume the form of a frog.

“That is a simple and pictorial outline of what we mean when we speak of the biogenetic law. We need, of course, much more

* Haeckel: His Life and Work. By William Bölsche. George W. Jacobs & Co.

than the one frog-fish before we can erect it into a law. But we have only to look around us and we find similar phenomena as common as pebbles.

"Let us bear in mind that evolution proceeded from certain amphibia to the lizards and from these to the birds and mammals. That is a long journey, but we have no alternative. If the amphibia (such as the frog and the salamander) descend from the fishes, all the higher classes up to man himself must also have done so. Hence the law must have transmitted even to ourselves this ancestral form of the gill-breathing fish.

"What a mad idea, many will say, that man should at one time be a tadpole like the frog! And yet—there's no help in prayer, as Falstaff said—even the human germ or embryo passes through a stage at which it shows the outlines of gills on the throat just like a fish. It is the same with the dog, the horse, the kangaroo, the duck mole, the bird, the crocodile, the turtle, the lizard. They all have the same structure.

"Nor is this an isolated fact. From the fish was evolved the amphibian. From this came the lizard. From the lizard came the bird. The lizard has solid teeth in his mouth. The bird has no teeth in its beak. That is to say, it has none to-day. But it had when it was a lizard. Here, then we have an intermediate stage between the fish and the bird. We must expect that the bird embryo in the egg will show some trace of it. As a matter of fact, it does so. When we examine young parrots in the egg we find that they have teeth in their mouth before the bill is formed. When the fact was first discovered, the real intermediate form between the lizard and the bird was not known. It was afterwards discovered at Solenhofen in a fossil impression from the Jurassic period. This was the archeopteryx, which had feathers like a real bird and yet had teeth in its mouth like the lizard when it lived on earth. The instance is instructive in two ways. In the first place it shows that we were quite justified in drawing our conclusions as to the past from the bird's embryonic form, even if the true transitional form between the lizard and the bird were one ancestral stage, that of the fish, is reproduced in the young bird in the egg the reproduction of two consecutive ancestral stages: one in the fish gills, the other in the lizard-like teeth. Once the law is admitted, there can be nothing strange in this. If one ancestral stage, that of the fish, is reproduced in the young animal belonging to a higher group, why not several?—why not all of them? No doubt, the ancestral series of the higher forms is of enormous length. What an immense number of stages there must have been before the fish! And then we have still the amphibian, the lizard, and the bird or mammal, up to man.

"Why should not the law run : the whole ancestral series must be reproduced in the development of each individual organism? We are now in a position to see the whole bearing of Haeckel's idea."

In analogy with this, is it not true that every thinking man and woman in the course of his or her development, epitomizes the history of human thought? To be more specific, I take it that you, reader, are an educated man of middle-class origin, and that you have been a socialist for at least six months, and have, of course, read Engels' "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific." Now, is it not a fact that your socialism has developed from Utopia toward Science exactly along the lines Engels has traced for the movement at large? So true was this in my case that for a long time I was inclined to push the biogenetic law too far and to conclude that every socialist had traveled the same road. I still think the law holds here, but not in the narrow way I first applied it.

In the course of my work as an agitator (and socialist agitation is the best School of Socialism) I met many sterling socialists who had never been Utopians as I had. They were born fighters, so to speak, and had been full of the class spirit, and fighting the capitalists in the trade-union and elsewhere in every way they could think of, long before they had ever heard of the ideal of the Co-operative Commonwealth. And these men are among our best and most uncompromising socialists. Here was a hard problem for me. I believed in my law, but it did not seem to cover the cases of these militant socialists. I was long in solving the problem, but I solved it at last.

Socialism has two aspects. As the most vital fact of modern life it is a kinetic force. "Modern Socialism" in Engels' words "is in its essence, the direct product of the recognition on the one hand, of the class antagonisms, existing in the society of to-day, between proprietors and non-proprietors, between capitalists and wageworkers; on the other hand, of the anarchy existing in production." This is Socialism, the most pregnant actuality in the palpitating life all about us. But, as Engels pointed out, Socialism also has its ideological side. In this sense it may correctly be called a theory, if we bear in mind that it is the virile force of class-feeling, and not the theory, that is going to effect the Social Revolution. Now, every individual socialist does in his development conform to the biogenetic law; but the bourgeois socialist is more apt to epitomize the history of Socialist theory, while the proletarian socialist recapitulates the development of class feeling as a kinetic force from blind and often unavailing hatred of the rich to the fruitful class-consciousness of the Marxian Socialist. The individual may combine these two processes in varying

proportions; but in broad outline the bourgeois may be expected to reproduce fairly closely the history of Socialism, as a theory, while the proletarian reproduces the history of Socialism, the great kinetic force.

While, from the standpoint of socialist theory, the statement of Doctor Parkhurst and many others that "Christ was a Socialist" is a manifest absurdity, the historian who traces back the history of Socialism, the kinetic force, will surely be led by the chain of fact to James and Jesus and Isaiah. For they were among those who gave most effective expression to the class hatred which is the lineal ancestor of Marxian Socialism viewed as a kinetic actuality. In this sense Jesus was one of the founders of Socialism.

Here are a few extracts from these ancient sowers of the seeds of discontent:

"The Lord will enter into judgment with the ancient of his people, and the princes thereof: for ye have eaten up the vineyard; the spoil of the poor is in your houses.

What mean ye that ye beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor? saith the Lord God of hosts."

"Wo unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth!" ISAIAH.

"Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter the kingdom of heaven.

And again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God."

"Wo unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation." JESUS.

"Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries: that shall come upon you.

"Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten.

"Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days.

"Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth; and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sebaoth." JAMES.

James would appear to have been somewhat more class-conscious than is deemed decorous by most of our modern Christian Socialists. But Isaiah and Jesus and James all give expres-

sion to precisely the same fierce emotions that I have many a time seen blazing out of the eyes of poor hopeless proletarians grouped around the soap-box; and it is the glory of Modern Socialism that it has been able to transform this fierce class hatred into intelligent class-consciousness which aims by loyalty to the Proletariat to rescue the rich as well as the poor from the fatal curse of economic inequality.

The bourgeois and the proletarian who come into the Socialist movement both have tadpole tails to lose in the course of their development into scientific socialists; but the tails are different. The proletarian has to rid himself of his hatred of the rich as individuals. He has to learn that Rockefeller, just as much as he himself, is a product of economic conditions. After he once thoroughly learns this there will be no danger of his being a Democrat or Anarchist or any other species of dangerous reactionary. The bourgeois tail is harder to lose. It consists of animistic, theological and dualistic habits of thought, issuing in utopianism and non-materialistic idealism. For, if I may be permitted to toy with the Hegelian dialectic in the manner of Marx, no man can be a fruitful idealist until he has become a materialist.

The socialist materialist realizes that the obsolescent ideals of Christianity and the Family have played leading roles in the great drama of human progress. It is impossible for him to speak lightly or contemptuously of the ideals which have sustained and comforted, guided and cheered countless hosts of his fellows through the long, dark ages of Christian Faith. But he knows that those ages are past and that present day adherence to the old ideals is atavistic and reactionary. But none-the-less his mental attitude toward the old ideals is one of reverent sympathy and, I had almost added, gratitude. This state of feeling has found perfect expression in these lines by William Morris:

“They are gone—the lovely, the mighty, the hope of the ancient
Earth;
It shall labor and bear the burden as’before that day of their
birth;
It shall groan in its blind abiding for the day that Sigurd hath
sped,
And the hour that Brynhild hath hastened, and the dawn that
waketh the dead;
It shall yearn, and be oft-times holpen, and forget their deeds no
more,
Till the new sun beams on Baldur, and the happy sealess shore.”

ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE.

(From *Socialism, Positive and Negative.*)

Landmarks of Scientific Socialism*.

BY UNANIMOUS vote as expressed in their enormous circulation in all the languages of the earth two volumes have come to be looked upon as the great propaganda classics of Socialism,—the “Communist Manifesto” and “Socialism, Utopian and Scientific”.

Most Socialists know that the latter work is but three chapters of an elaborate reply written by Engel's to one Eugene Duehring, whose only title to fame now lies in the fact that he was fortunate enough to be intellectually demolished by Frederick Engels. Many socialists have doubtless wondered why the remainder of the “Anti-Duehring” has not been translated into English. They liked the “sample” and would have gladly devoured more had it been accessible. Those who had read the German usually replied to this question by stating that a large part of the untranslated portion was taken up with personal controversy and ridicule of Duehring, which would be unintelligible to one who did not know the object at which the sarcasm and invective was aimed.

In the translation which now lies before us this difficulty has been most happily met. Austin Lewis, the translator, has not hesitated to cut out these uninteresting and unimportant portions, or to shorten and summarize them, while he has made accessible to the English speaking world, a great mass of valuable material.

As those who have read the introduction to “Socialism Utopian and Scientific,” will remember, Duehring had signalized his “conversion” to socialism, like many another convert, by setting about the reformation of Socialism, and the better to do this he evolved an entire philosophy of human life. In order to thoroughly answer him, Engels was forced to follow his devious wanderings in all paths of human investigation. The result is that in this book we have the best summary of the Socialist philosophy, as a philosophy, that has, perhaps ever been written.

Herr Duehring had based his philosophy on “eternal truths,” and on his own system of physics, chemistry, biology, ethics and economics, and into all these fields Engels follows him.

He starts off with a definition of Socialism, which in some respects can scarcely be improved upon:

* Landmarks of Scientific Socialism. (Anti-Duehring). By Frederick Engels, translated by Austin Lewis. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, \$1.00.

"Modern socialism is in its essence the product of the existence on the one hand of the class antagonisms which are dominant in modern society, between the property possessors and those who have no property and between the wage workers and the bourgeois; and, on the other, of the anarchy which is prevalent in modern production. In its theoretical form however it appears as a development of the fundamental ideas of the great French philosophers of the eighteenth century. Like every new theory it was obliged to attach itself to the existing philosophy however deeply its roots were embedded in the economic fast."

Engels places himself firmly upon the dialectic method with these words:

"If we examine nature, the history of man or our own intellectual activities, we have presented to us an endless coil of interrelations and changes in which nothing is constant whatever be its nature, time or position, but everything is in motion, suffers change and passes away."

Upon this basis he proceeds to develop the philosophy of historical materialism.

We cannot concern ourselves long with his discussions of metaphysics, or of natural science, because in both these fields the positions he maintains are now practically accepted, so far as their fundamental principles are concerned, and it is only in his illustrations, which necessarily were taken from contemporaneous science, that there has been change. It is, however, interesting to see this early socialist championing the cause of Darwin at a time when most scientists were still denying the truths of evolution.

The chapter on "Morals and Law" serves to dispose of some old bug-a-boos of "eternal truths" and "justice" and "equality" that are still found in the minds of the great mass of capitalist thinkers. His treatment of the "equality" idea is worthy of reproduction:

As well known, the bourgeois class as soon as it escaped from the domination of the ruling class in the cities, by which process the medieval stage passes into the modern, has been steadily and inevitably dogged by a shadow, the proletariat. So also the bourgeois demands for equality are accompanied by the proletarian demands for equality. Directly the demand for the abolition of class privileges was made by the bourgeois there succeeded the proletarian demand for the abolition of classes themselves. This was first made in a religious form and was based upon early Christianity, but later derived its support from the bourgeois theories of equality. The proletarians take the bourgeois at their word, they demand the realisation of equality not merely apparently, not merely in the sphere of government but actually in the sphere of society and economics. Since the French bourgeoisie of the great Revolution placed equality in the foreground of their movement, the French proletariat has answered it blow for blow with the demand for social and economic equality, and equality has become the special battle cry of the French proletariat.

The demand for equality as made by the proletariat has a double significance. Either it is, as was particularly the case at first, in the Peasants War, for example, a natural reaction against social inequalities which were obvious, against the contrast between rich and poor,

masters and slaves, luxurious and hungry, and as such it is simply an expression of revolutionary instinct finding its justification in that fact and in that fact alone. On the other hand it may arise from reaction against the bourgeois claims of equality from which it deduces more or less just and far reaching claims, serves as a means of agitation to stir the workers, by means of a cry adopted by the capitalists themselves, against the capitalists, and in this case stands or falls with bourgeois equality itself. In both cases the real content of the proletarian claims of equality is the abolition of classes. Every demand for equality transcending this is of necessity absurd.

So the notion of equality, in its proletarian as well as in its bourgeois form, is itself a historic product. Certain circumstances were required to produce it and these in their turn proceeded from a long anterior history. It is therefore anything but an eternal truth. And if the public regards it as self-evident in one sense or another, if, as Marx remarks "already occupies the position of a popular prejudice" it is not due to its being an axiomatic truth but to the universal broadening of conception in accordance with the spirit of the eighteenth century.

It is in the portion dealing with "Political Economy" and "Socialism" however that the most valuable material is found.

Here we have clearly set forth the idea that each social stage must have its own political economy and that there are no universal economic laws, truths which some of our colleges have not yet learned, although they are slowly and grudgingly, and never with credit, accepting the truths set forth by socialist writers of more than a generation ago. Here is the way Engels states this point:

Political economy is, in the widest sense, the science of the laws controlling the production and exchange of the material necessities of life in human society. Production and exchange are two entirely different functions. Production may exist without exchange, exchange—since there can only be exchange of products—cannot exist without production. Each of the two social functions is controlled by entirely different external influences and thus has, generally speaking, its own peculiar laws. But on the other hand they become so mutually involved at a given time and react one upon the other that they might be designated the abscissas and ordinates of the economic curve.

The conditions under which men produce and exchange develop from land to land, and in the same land from generation to generation. Political economy cannot be the same for all lands and for all historical epochs. From the bow and arrow, from the stone knife and the exceptional and occasional trading intercourse of the barbarian to the steam engine with its thousands of horsepower, to the mechanical weaving machine, to the railway and the Bank of England is a tremendous leap. The Patagonians do not have production on a large scale and world-commerce any more than they have swindling or bankruptcy. Anyone who should attempt to apply the same laws of political economy to Patagonia as to present-day England would only succeed in producing stupid commonplaces. Political economy is thus really a historical science. It is engaged with historical material, that is, material which is always in course of development. At the close of this investigation it can, for the first time, show the few, (especially as regards production and exchange) general laws

which apply universally. In this way it is made evident that the laws which are common to certain methods of production or forms of exchange are common to all historical periods in which these methods of production and forms of exchange are the same. Thus for example with the introduction of the specie, there came into being a series of laws which holds good for all lands and historical epochs in which specie is a means of exchange.

Again those who are expecting a recognition of the injustice of social relations to bring about socialism would do well to ponder these words of Engels:

While political economy in a narrow sense arose in the minds of a few geniuses of the seventeenth century, it is, in its positive formulation by the physiocrats and Adam Smith, substantially a child of the eighteenth century, and expresses itself in the acquisitions of the great contemporary French philosophers with all the excellencies and defects of that time. What we have said of the French philosophers applies also to the economists of that day. The new science was with them not the expression of the condition and needs of the time but the expression of eternal reason; the laws of production and exchange discovered by them were not the laws of a given historical form of those facts but eternal natural laws; they derived them from the nature of man. But this man, seen clearly, was a burgher of the Middle Ages on the high road to becoming a modern bourgeois, and his nature consisted in this that he had to manufacture commodities and carry on his trade according to the given historical conditions of that period.

(Herr Duehring having applied the two man theory to political economic conditions and having decided that such conditions are unjust, upon which conclusion he bases his revolutionary attitude, Engels remarks as follows):

"If we have no better security for the revolution in the present methods of distribution of the products of labor with all their crying antagonisms of misery and luxury, of poverty and ostentation, than the consciousness that this method of distribution is unjust and that justice must finally prevail, we should be in evil plight and would have to stay there a long time. The mystics of the Middle Ages who dreamed of an approaching thousand years kingdom of righteousness had the consciousness of the injustice of class antagonisms. At the beginning of modern history three hundred years ago, Thomas Muenzer shouted it aloud to all the world. In the English and French bourgeois revolutions the same cry was heard and died away ineffectually. And if the same cry, after the formation of class antagonisms and class distinctions left the working, suffering classes cold until 1830, if it now takes hold of one land after another with the same results and the same intensity, in proportion as the greater industry has developed in the individual countries, if in one generation, it has acquired a force which defies all the powers opposed to it and can be sure of victory in the near future—how comes it about? From this, that the greater industry has created the modern proletariat, a class, which for the first time in history can set about the abolition not of this or that particular class organization or of this or that particular class privilege but of classes in general, and it is in the position that it must carry out this line of action on the penalty of sinking to the Chinese coolie level. And that the same greater industry has on the other hand produced a class which is in possession of all the tools of production

and the means of life but in every period of prosperity (Schwindel-periode) and in each succeeding panic shows that it is incapable of controlling in the future the growing productive forces; a class under whose leadership society runs headlong to ruin like a locomotive whose closed safety valve the engine driver is too weak to open. In other words it has come about that the productive forces of the modern capitalistic mode of production as well as the system of distribution based upon it are in glaring contradiction to the mode of production itself and to such a degree that a revolution in the modes of production and distribution must take place which will abolish all class differences or the whole of modern society will fall. It is in these actual material facts, which are necessarily becoming more and more evident to the exploited proletariat, that the confidence in the victory of modern socialism finds its foundation and not in this or that bookworm's notions of justice and injustice.

Duehring argued that exploitation is based upon force and that therefore political force is the dominant fact and not economic power. Again Engels' reply has a very modern sound, as an answer to those who seek to use the capitalistic state as a means of abolishing present conditions without abolishing the class character of that state, or to those who consider that the possession of that state by the capitalist class will enable them to permanently enslave the workers:

If political conditions are the decisive causes of economic conditions the modern bourgeoisie would necessarily not have progressed as the result of a fight with feudalism, but would be the darling child of its womb. Everybody knows that the opposite is the case. The bourgeoisie, originally bound to pay feudal dues to the dominant feudal nobility, recruited from bond slaves and thralls, in a subject state, has, in the course of its conflict with the nobility captured position after position, and finally has come into possession of the power in civilized countries. In France it directly attacked the nobility, in England it made the aristocracy more and more bourgeois and finally incorporated it with itself as a sort of ornament. And how did this come about? Entirely through the transformation of economic conditions which was sooner or later followed either by the voluntary or compulsory transformation of political conditions. The fight of the bourgeoisie against the feudal nobility is the fight of the city against the country, of industry against landlordism, of economy based on money against economy based on natural products. The distinguished weapons of the bourgeois in this fight were those which came into existence through the development of increasing economic force by reason of the growth at first of hand manufacture and afterwards machine-manufacture and through the extension of trade. During the whole of this conflict the political power was in the hands of the nobility, with the exception of a period when the king employed the bourgeoisie against the nobility in order to hold one in check by means of the other. From the very moment, however, in which the bourgeoisie still deprived of political power began to be dangerous because of the development of its economic power the monarchy again turned to the nobility and thereby brought about the revolution of the bourgeois first in England and then in France. The political conditions in France remained unaltered until the economic conditions outgrew them. In politics the noble was everything, the bourgeoisie was of the highest importance while the nobility had abandoned all

its social functions and yet pocketed revenues, social services which it did not any longer perform. Even this is not sufficient. Bourgeois society was, as far as the whole matter of production is concerned, tied and bound in the political feudal forms of the Middle Ages, which this production, not only as regards manufacture but as regards handwork also had long transcended amid all the thousand-fold gild-privileges and local and provincial tax impositions which had become mere obstacles and fetters to production. The bourgeois revolution put an end to them. But the economic condition did not, as Herr Duehring would imply, forthwith adapt itself to the political circumstances, — that the king and the nobility spent a long time in trying the effect — but it threw all the mouldy old political rubbish aside and shaped new political conditions in which the new economic conditions might come into existence and develop. And it has developed splendidly in this suitable political and legal atmosphere, so splendidly that the bourgeoisie is now not very far from the position which the nobility occupied in 1789. It is becoming more and more not alone a social superfluity but a social impediment. It takes an ever diminishing part in the work of production and becomes more and more, as the noble did, a mere revenue consuming class. And this revolution in its position and the creation of a new class, that of the proletariat, came about without any force-nonsense but by purely economic means. Further more, it has by no means accomplished it by its own willful act. On the other hand it has accomplished itself irresistibly against the wish and intentions of the bourgeoisie. Its own productive forces have taken the management of affairs and are driving modern bourgeois society to the necessity of revolution or destruction.

Other phases of political economy and socialism are taken up and discussed in the same fundamental manner.

While this larger work can never become so popular, nor so fundamental as "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific", it is not too much to say that the time will come when every Socialist who makes any pretensions to familiarity with the fundamentals of Socialism will have a copy of this translation in his library.

A. M. SIMONS.

The Margin of Leisure.

"If I am to listen to another man's opinion, it must be expressed positively."—*Goethe*.

WHEN today one puts aside his own immediate affairs to think of the city around him, it is not improbable that a curiosity in regard to the effect of the new conditions upon the people of San Francisco will be found to have usurped the earlier interest excited by ruins and reconstructions. And since here ingenuity and resourcefulness are fully matched by circumstances, the activities of any group in the community would afford the economist an unexampled opportunity for investigation. But, out of the entire population, it will be found in general that the attention tends to fix itself upon the conduct of the laboring class. For the laborer, in his collective capacity, is the man of the hour, and as a consequence the spirit in which he meets this opportunity is a subject of immediate concern.

In the present labor situation one phase in particular has attracted my own interest to such a degree that I have been led to examine it in its widest bearings. Of this phase the following is stated as a typical instance. Two men were found, after much trouble, to undertake the plastering of a building in the burned district. They were to be paid twelve dollars per day of eight hours. To the disgust of the owner, however, he soon found the men were working but a half day each. When questioned, they explained that they were satisfied with earning six dollars and therefore declined to work more than half time. The cases of similar character, occurring in various employments from washerwomen earning two dollars a day up, are sufficient to eliminate the element of individual caprice.

Expressed in general terms what is shown by this course of action is that after the individual is assured of the necessities of life he tends to prefer the control of Time to the accumulation of Wealth.

"The chief work of economic science, Marshall says, is connected with the measurement of motives by the price which, as a normal or general rule, is sufficient to induce a person of a particular class under given conditions to undertake a certain task or undergo a certain sacrifice. A statement with regard to the tend-

encies of man's action under certain conditions is an economic law."

This quotation gives at least a partial clue to the reason why the rule of the Margin of Leisure just stated is not usually to be found in works on economics. For it illustrates the bent among economists to confine their investigations to minima, to base their conclusions on the phenomena observable at the lower limit of the money equivalent involved in transactions. Quite clearly, however, there may be an upper limit where it is possible that new phenomena make their appearance. In the case of the plasterers mentioned it may be taken for granted that such an upper limit has been reached.

The statement of this tendency in connection with the laboring class is significant, not because of a special applicability to this class, but simply because it can be recognized as applicable to it in any degree.

The rule is, in fact, applicable to every grade of society. Thus, the "leisure class" is made up of persons who are sufficiently supplied with the necessities of life and so make no effort to increase their incomes. It must not be supposed that the "leisure class" is confined to the "wealthy" or the socially conspicuous. Any person with resources sufficient to provide for him the necessities of life, without present labor, and who retains control of his Time, is a member of the "leisure class".

Again the operation of the tendency may be traced in the commercial classes. It would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that every man engaged in commerce plans to retire from business at some point in his career. If he does not retire at least he throws the drudgery of his work upon other shoulders and thus releases much of his own time. Here also it should be noted that those who retire with just enough to provide the necessities in the condition of life to which they have been accustomed far outnumber those who retire with "fortunes".

A modern community contains, then, three principal classes: — people in complete control of their time; people devoting all or part of their time to business in the hope of securing complete control of their time later in life; people whose endeavor is to obtain a Margin of Leisure, as they earn their livelihood, day by day.

The contrast between the methods of the commercial and the laboring classes is characteristic and radical. The business man works for an uncertain accumulation which he does not always get and but infrequently is able to turn to account; the laborer works for a definite modicum which there is every reason to believe he may secure.

But while the case of the plasterers may seem exeptional, the action of the men is in accord with the conclusion reached by Jevons;—

“Laborers,” he says, “enjoying little more than the necessities of life, . . . will work less hard as the product increases. . . The same rule seems to hold throughout the mercantile employments. The richer a man becomes, the less does he devote himself to business.”

With an agreement as to the phenomena there is, however, a wide difference in the interpretation placed upon them by Jevons and by the present writer. Where Jevons observes the conclusion of a series of competitive tendencies in a cessation from labor on account of its painfulness, the writer sees evidence of a redirection of energy, which passes on from the object of labor as fulfilled, to the possession of Time as only commencing.

The object of labor is physical sustenance. “The existence of man,” as Seligman says, “depends upon his ability to sustain himself.” The redirection of energy which takes place after the object of labor has been attained, has for its object the exercise and development of that characteristic of man which distinguishes him pre-eminently; namely, the power of thought. “All human progress is at bottom mental progress. The means necessary for the exercise of thought, and so for all human progress, is the control of Time. The factor of Time bears a relation to the satisfaction of mental wants similar to that which Wealth bears to the satisfaction of subsistence wants. As however the latter must be provided for first—the discommodity of labor—there remains for application to the former only a variable Margin of Leisure.

The absence of any comprehensive study of Time as an economic factor is hard to understand. Marshall, who refers to it as “the source of many of the greatest difficulties in economics,” treats of it at some length in connection with problems of supply and demand; but the word does not even appear in the index of the majority of works on economics. The different phases under which Time appears, as for example in connection with production or interest, may account to a certain extent for the neglect of it as an independent subject. But the habitual acceptance of terms which obscure its recognition may also have contributed to the same result.

Thus in his essay on *Civilization* John Stuart Mill says: “There are two elements of importance and influence among mankind: the one is property; the other, powers and acquirements of mind.” It does not appear that in making this antithesis Mill was conscious of contrasting factors which belong to different categories. As an institution property may be “primary and fundament-

al," but when, as here, it is contrasted with intelligence, it must be regarded as secondary, as the result of efforts instigated by desires. Physical wants and mental wants may be compared, or the means of providing for each of these may be compared; so the terms of the antithesis which Mill desired would be, on the one hand property or wealth, and on the other the Margin of Leisure.

The distinction in much the same form as it is used by Mill reappears throughout the extent of economic literature. This would seem to point to the general recognition that man's activity is conditioned by the necessity of providing for two different classes of wants; in the first place he must sustain life, in the second he must make provision for his mental development.

That leisure is the prerequisite of mental development has been recognized by men in all times.

The emphasis laid on it by Aristotle both in the *Ethics* and *Politics*, has been a source of trouble to his commentators.

He says, "in size and extent (the state) should be such as may enable the inhabitants to live temperately and liberally in the enjoyment of leisure."

Again, "nothing is more absolutely necessary than to provide that the highest (the governing) class, not only when in office, but when out of office, should have leisure."

And the end of the *Ethics* appears to be that happiness consists in the exercise of the intellect, and requires perfect leisure.

Probably the most remarkable passage in literature bearing on this point is contained in *Ecclesiasticus*, the book of "the wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach." (The passage is however too long to quote in full.)

"The wisdom of the scribe cometh by opportunity of leisure;

"And he that hath little business shall become wise.

"How shall he become wise that holdeth the plow,

"That glorieth in the shaft of the goad,

"That driveth oxen, and is occupied in their labors,

"And whose discourse is of the stock of bulls?

"He will set his heart upon turning his furrows;

"And his wakefulness is to give his heifers their fodder.

"So is every artificer and workmaster....

"So is the smith sitting by the anvil....

"So is the potter sitting at his work....

"All these put their trust in their hands;

"And each becometh wise in his own work....

"They shall not be sought for in the council of the people....

"And where parables are they shall not be found.

"But they will maintain the fabric of the world;

"And in the handywork of their craft is their prayer,

"Not so he that hath applied his soul,
 "And meditateth in the law of the Most High;
 "He will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients,
 "And will be occupied in prophecies. . . .
 "Many shall commend his understanding;
 "And so long as the world endureth, it shall not be blotted out:
 "His memorial shall not depart,
 "And his name shall live from generation to generation."

Similar quotations, showing the relation of leisure and thought, might be multiplied; and practically every biography of a man of genius ever written might be introduced as evidence in support of the same fact. It will only be necessary, however, to direct attention to some opinions typical of those held by economists to-day.

"Some surplus over the necessities of life," Marshall says, "is required to support that mental effort in which progress takes its rise. It is needed then, diligently, to inquire whether the present industrial organization might not with advantage be so modified as to increase the opportunities which the lower grades of industry have for using their mental faculties."

Gide also thinks "that we should endeavor to assure to all persons a certain amount of leisure, to make them free to participate in all those liberal activities which are both a duty and an honor."

Aristotle has been seen, held that the governing or highest class in the state should have leisure; the mechanic he held could not even be admitted to citizenship in the best form of state. To-day, on the other hand, enlightened opinion holds that the laborer should have a Margin of Leisure assured to him.

It is a symptom of a tendency in modern society that these opinions of Marshall, Gide and others are most significant; the counterpart in the world of thought, to the action of the plasterers already mentioned. What neither the scholars nor the laborers seem to have grasped clearly is that a certain stage has now been reached in the struggle that was old when Aristotle wrote; the struggle for a Margin of Leisure in which to exercise or develop the powers of mind, a struggle which follows inevitably from the character of the human species.

It is not practicable in the present instance to follow this struggle through the phases of its history. Attention may, however, be called to the fact, pointed out by Fustel de Coulanges, that in the early stages of Greek and Roman society, dominance, which meant the most complete control of the leisure of the group and its accumulated knowledge, went by primogeniture. After a time the rule of primogeniture disappears and, as a result, the

younger branches of the family are liberated. The disappearance of the clientship is included by Fustel in this revolution, inasmuch as the client, while in reality a serf, was a part of the family. Later, by another revolution, the plebs entered the city and thus gained a status in the community. What appears in the remote stages of society described by the author of the *Ancient City*, is typical of the relations between the aristocracy, the mercantile class, and the laboring class of more recent times. The "first comers" enjoy possession until the stratum next in order takes a share in the leisure it has helped to earn, and in the accumulated knowledge of the group. As Mill pointed out there is no instance of any class of society, in the possession of power, ever having used this power in the interest of the other classes of society. Each lower class has been compelled to fight in turn for its share in the Margin of Leisure. For the last century the line of conflict has been between the mercantile and the laboring classes.

In the course of this struggle the upper classes have used many arguments and of these some account must be taken.

Thus men who have had the leisure to exercise thought have always expressed grave fears at the effect of leisure on those who have not been so favored. Gide in speaking of the modern "slavery of machinery," thinks that the slavery of natural forces would have similarly disastrous effects on the men of the twentieth century to what antique slavery had on the masters in Greece and Rome. He fears that the men of to-day "might in the course of time have no ideal but that of the degenerate Romans:—*panem et circenses*."

Such views are properly met by the answer "it is only through freedom to use leisure as they will, that people can learn to use leisure well."

Of greater importance however, is the plea made for the "leisure class" on the basis of the service it has rendered to society. Here again the opinion expressed by Gide may be taken. "It cannot be denied," he says, "from the historical point of view, that the so-called idle rich have in the past performed a genuine social function, a social function of the very first importance; namely the creation of the arts, the sciences, literature, politics, refinement and culture, everything, in a word, that constitutes civilization. We owe all these things to the idle rich of Greece, Rome, Judea, and of all those antique societies in which it must be admitted that idleness possessed the particularly odious characteristic of being due solely to force, robbery, and slavery."

Irony could have achieved no more drastic substitution of appearance for reality than this. What history does show is that "everything that constitutes civilization" has proceeded, not from

the idle rich but from the Margin of Leisure in the community. Whatever truth is at the bottom of such an argument as that given above rests on the fact that the idle rich succeeded in absorbing the greater part of the available leisure, and succeeded in guarding the accumulated knowledge of the group from the classes below them.

As a working policy, the dominating class patronized those of the lower classes who displayed genius too aggressive to be neglected; and in its own interest absorbed the brighter minds that appeared among the lower orders. Hence arose the view expressed by Ben Jonson: "Learning needs rest; sovereignty gives it. Sovereignty needs council: learning affords it. And from whom doth (the prince) hear discipline more willingly, or the arts discouraged more gladly, than from those whom his own bounty and benefits have made able and faithful?"

In dealing with the people as a whole, the patrician class used its religious and political prestige and organization to inculcate its own views. The habit of respect in the people led most of them to accept unquestioningly the injunctions of their masters "that ye study to be quiet, and to work with your hands, even as we charged you." Indeed the entire resources of praise, allurements, warning and threat have been exhausted in the effort to keep men working with their hands in quietness. Could men only be convinced of the inherent beneficence of toil, could they be persuaded to sink their minds in unremitting drudgery, then the uprisings of plebs, peasant insurrections and latter-day strikes would be unknown. But, fortunately, there have never lacked revolutionaries of independent and aggressive minds to overthrow the plans for a permanent social organization, based on the exclusion of any from the benefits created by all.

It has been necessary here to confine myself to the most general terms, and to state in positive language considerations which in reality are most intricate in character. This is, however, the only method possible in calling attention to factors of social importance which at least appear to have been unduly neglected; there need be no fear of the established opinion suffering from the lack of advocates.

Stated in briefest outline it seems that certain observed facts in society can best be explained on the theory that after the individual is assured of the necessities of life he tends to prefer the control of Time to the accumulation of Wealth.

On re-examination of society this theory would seem to be verified by the tendency for persons engaged in commercial pursuits to retire, or at least to devote less time to business as it becomes more profitable.

The explanation here given of this phenomenon is that by reason of the characteristics of human nature, man must provide for two different classes of wants: the subsistence of his body and the exercise of his mental faculties. Time, or the Margin of Leisure, it is believed, bears a similar relation to the satisfaction of the latter wants, that Wealth does to the former.

That a Margin of Leisure is the prerequisite of mental development, has been recognized from time immemorial; but it has been thought apparently that the few only and not the many could be entrusted with leisure. To-day we see, however, that not only are economists of the highest standing coming to recognize that a margin of Leisure is necessary to every individual in society, but, as shown in the typical instance with which this paper commenced, that the laboring class is beginning to secure for itself such a Margin.

FREDERICK J. TEGGART.

EDITORIAL

Progress of the Idaho Battle.

Another month has dragged by and so far as the legal proceedings are concerned but little has been accomplished in the Idaho trial. Probably by the time this reaches the readers a jury will have been selected and the taking of evidence begun.

So far as the outcome of the trial is concerned it now seems certain that the men will never be hung. Roosevelt's "Undesirable Citizen" letter settled that by raising such a volume of protest and attracting such intense interest in the case as to make impossible the carrying out of any plot. To be sure the venires that have been drawn indicate an attempt to pack the jury. Although the number of wage workers in the county is equal to that of the number of farmers only a half dozen of the former have appeared in contrast with a couple of hundred of the latter.

After all, however, the real battle now, as in the past, is not in Boise. The lines of the struggle long ago extended beyond the confines of that little Western city and the events there are little more than reflections of the great struggle going on throughout the country. The most significant fact of this wider battle has been the solidifying effect which it has had upon labor factions. Hitherto widely separated and most fiercely antagonistic bodies have joined in Moyer-Haywood conferences and have worked together with tireless energy for the common good and most important of all, the gap which has existed between the organized labor movement and the revolutionary political movement has been closed up in a host of cities.

The socialists began the fight but in every instance they have shown a willingness to not simply co-operate with the trade unions but stand aside wherever it became evident that the large body could do more effective work in arousing class interest and class enthusiasm and a revolt in behalf of the imprisoned officers of the Western Federation of Miners. This fact has not escaped the notice of the ruling

class. Indeed it is the one thing that has frightened them. And well it might frighten them; for on the day when organized labor and socialism become identical the beginning of the end of capitalism is here.

So startled have been the organs of capitalism by this suddenly acquired solidarity and socialist attitude of labor that they have been thrown into something almost like a panic. All over the country the press has been warning labor unionists against the dangers of affiliation with the terrible red flag men. Finally the strenuous occupant of the White House exercised his propensity for butting in by writing his famous letter to the Pittsburg Labor World. This insignificant little sheet had never been heard of outside its immediate locality until its editor demonstrated his sycophancy by endorsing President Roosevelt's "undesirable citizen" letter. At once the President hastened to send him a personal letter assuring him of the support of the highest official in our present government and declaring it to be his (the president's) desire to "drive a wedge" into the labor movement, between the desirable and undesirable citizens.

The effect of this letter, however, was not exactly what was expected. As on several previous occasions, the phraseology chosen by the president was not the most happy in the world. Trade unionists, no matter whether socialists or not, do not like to have a wedge driven into the labor movement. Most of the capitalist papers saw this point even if Roosevelt did not and "played the story down," so that very little was made of it.

It is safe to say that while there will undoubtedly be wedges driven into the labor movement many times in the future, yet it will never be possible to split the trade unions and the socialist movement as widely apart as they have been in the past. In hundreds of cases the temporary Moyer and Haywood conferences will prove but the beginning of the process of amalgamation and education which will force organized labor to recognize the necessity of solidarity on the wider field of political action. Thus again, as hundreds of times before, a blow from the enemy only succeeded in driving closer together the particles of labor and welding them into a more compact mass.

There is just one trifling exception to the solidarity that is worthy of notice and this, we are sorry to say, is at the very point where the solidarity ought to be most evident. Some of the correspondents of the socialist papers at Boise are evidently under the impression that they personally and not Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, or even the great working class battle, are the center of attraction and have fought with a disgustingly petty jealousy to get into the lime light. That any person should at this time consider personal squabbles of greater importance than the great battle which is now taking place seems almost incredible.

Let us hope that this disgusting exhibition may have at least a

brief recess until the trial is over and then it is to be hoped that the Socialist Party will know how to deal with those who have so thoroughly proven their lack not only of all consciousness of class solidarity but of those common decencies which are supposed to prevail among human beings in any organized society.

The Red Flag.

There has been a sudden revival of hostility or rather expressions of hostility to the Red Flag on the part of the capitalist press during the last few weeks. The reason for this is not far to seek. The processions of Moyer-Haywood protest meetings have usually carried this emblem and these processions have been the outward sign of a growing solidarity of class interest. This antagonism to the emblem of International Socialism has been met largely in one of two ways. Some of the weaker hearted comrades who have shown an inclination to drop the Red Flag entirely have been explaining that its use only tended to prejudice and arouse antagonism.

Others seem inclined to outdo the patriotic purveyor of capitalist ideals in devotion to an emblem and would flaunt the Red Flag as the principal method of propaganda. It is easy to reply to the first and to show that it is not the Red Flag, as such, that capitalism fears and that blue, green, yellow or any other color would be equally repulsive if it stood for a working class movement. Capitalism cannot be captured by stealth. Changing the name and the emblem would never enable us to get within the ramparts of the present ruling class without being caught.

There is no sense in talking about dropping the emblem that has long been symbolical of working class solidarity. At the same time socialists would be very foolish to center their fight around the right to carry a particular sort of an emblem. It would be too much like the peasant revolts of the middle ages which would never start until the magical red banner with its embroidered peasant's shoe in the center was ready to unfurl and where on several occasions the uprising was prevented by the simple process of stealing the banner.

That the ruling class is finding it necessary to attack our emblems shows also that they are not repellent to the working class. If they were, the more we carried them the better it would please the powers that be. The whole attitude is simply significant of the growing class struggle and the growing strength of the revolutionary movement.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The National Association of Manufacturers, the organization that was formed by David M. Parry, C. W. Post, Kirby, Nunemacher and other middle class plutocrats who hate the "labor trust" like poison, held its annual convention in New York during the past month and renewed its declaration of war to the knife and knife to the bilt upon organized labor. J. W. Van Cleave, of St. Louis, upon whose shoulders the presidential mantle fell when Parry retired, appealed to the 3,000 capitalists who are members of the N. A. M., for nothing less than \$1,500,000 with which to exterminate trade unionism and socialism, one-third of which sum is to be paid in each twelve months during the next three years. The convention endorsed the president's plan and action was taken to gather the war fund and to oppose trade unions to the finish in every future contest of importance. Van Cleave is as uncompromising a foe of organized labor as was his predecessor. He is president of the Bucks Stove & Range Co., in St. Louis, and, just to show in what contempt he holds the workers, he had notices posted in his plant several months ago notifying the metal polishers and other employes that they would be required to work ten hours a day instead of nine, as they had been accustomed. The men struck and are still out, and a national boycott has been declared against Bucks stoves and ranges.

Like Parry, Van Cleave is particularly hostile toward the socialist element in the labor movement. The former is said to have retired from the presidency of the N. A. M. for the purpose of utilizing all his spare time to rescue the working class from the dangers of socialism. His consuming ambition is to be regarded as the intellectual leader and generalissimo of anti-socialism. He has even taken himself seriously enough to write a book called "The Scarlet Empire," which he hoped would become the standard authority to explode the fallacious doctrine of establishing a co-operative commonwealth. But there is something lacking in this great work, for it is accumulating dust on book shelves and is never quoted even in kindergartens. However, while Mr. Parry is sadly disappointed in his failure to strike a popular chord and realize his great ambition to become the idol of the "aunties," he will persevere, and rumor has it that he is again burning midnight oil and is still hopeful of winning the laurel wreath of a literary genius. Van Cleave, too, has seized his trusty pen, and in his "Square Deal," an organ which he inherited from Post, the Battle Creek manufacturer of gripenuts and postmortum cereals, and in his presidential proclamations in the semi-monthly "American Industries," he plunges into the fray with gusto, not to say eclat. Naturally the followers of Parry, Van Cleave,

Post, et. al., are taking their cue from their leaders and the campaign to "smash socialism" is an inspiring one. It must be discouraging to "sissy" Easely and his National Civic Federation and Sam Gompers and his pure and simple aggregation to find the Parry-Van Cleave crowd robbing them of their thunder and bidding for popularity in the "smash" campaign. And when one stops to survey the field and notes the many different directions from which the armies of "aunties" are marching to destroy socialism, one cannot but sympathize with the intended victim—the puny, young and unsophisticated Socialist party.

Just why the National Association of Manufacturers should decide to accumulate a huge fund for the purpose of making war upon the unions controlled by the conservatives, and who uphold and defend the system that makes the Parrys and Van Cleave possible, is a deep mystery. Gompers & Co. mean no harm—in fact they loudly deplore raising any issue or doing ought that may be calculated to arouse the ire and attract the antagonism of the capitalist class. We must be conservative in our demands and temperate in our language, they say, for fear that our masters may take offense. If the manufacturers increase the cost of necessities 20 per cent, let us request an advance of 10 per cent in wages; if the increase be 40 per cent in necessities, we shall ask 20 per cent more wages, and thus plug the hole of deficit in our purchasing power. The capitalists must have a "fair share" of profits or they would not become multi-millionaires and it would not pay them to hunt around for work for the workingman to do. The only explanation for the decision of the N. A. M. to raise \$1,500,000 to be used in combating organized labor is probably found in the fact that the great, big capitalists are squeezing the middle class crowd so hard that the latter hope to recoup their losses or get rich quicker by shaking more wealth out of the working class.

There is no doubt but much of the \$1,500,000 to be raised by the National Association of Manufacturers will be utilized in corrupting the labor movement and honeycombing the unions with their espionage systems. Nor is there any longer doubt of the close connection between the Citizens Alliance and the Pinkerton agency, and the National Association of Manufacturers with the Corporations Auxiliary, the Manufacturers' Information Bureau and kindred concerns that boast of having elaborate organizations of sneaks and traitors in the unions. Recently one of these agencies, the Corporations Auxiliary, in appealing for patronage from that element among the capitalists—like the Carnegies and Belmonts and Baers—who realize the danger and futility of completely destroying unions, but who would rather direct and control them, made the statement in a confidential circular that its emissaries are helping to "run" the unions along conservative grooves.

"Our experience has convinced us," says the communication to the capitalists, "that the best way to control labor organizations is to lead and not to force them. We are also convinced that the conservative element in all unions will control when properly led and officered, which we are prepared to do. We help to eliminate the agitator and organizer quietly and with little or no friction, and further, through the employment of our system, you will know at all times whom among your employees are loyal and to be depended upon."

Now while this grafting spying agency unquestionably makes extravagant claims, it is nevertheless true that some of the emissaries of the dozen odd sneak and traitor bureaus have pushed themselves to the front and occupied positions of prominence. This fact is clearly illustrated in "The Pinkerton Labor Spy," just issued, which shows that one Smith, a Pink thing, was appointed an organizer of the United Mine Workers, a fellow named Cochran held a similar position in the Western Federation of Miners, still another named Gratiot was the most trusted official in the strike at Denver, and many other reptiles wormed their way into organizations for the purpose of betraying workmen for blood money. Several years ago the writer obtained and published a complete list of spies and traitors, employed by the Manufacturers' Information Bureau, who were under direction of many of the leading trusts and combines in the country. Some of the scoundrels were holding positions of honor and responsibility in various bodies and were driven out, others operated under assumed names and could not be traced, having a new in every place where they applied their nefarious occupation.

While these degenerated procurers of scabs and traitors are aiming to claim credit for many foolish things that are done by the so-called conservatives, and becoming rich and fat in their grafting, the truth is that, with possibly an exception here and there, the union officials are as conscientious and incorruptible lot of men as can be found in any avenue of life. Generally they are cordially hated and fought hard by capitalists and receive plenty of "knocks" from their own people, only to be dumped sooner or later, despite their hysterical assurances that they are safely and sanely conservative. Just why, after being constantly on the firing line of the class struggle and forced to plan and worry and work to keep their organizations intact, these so-called "leaders" should exuberantly and monotonously plume themselves upon conserving the present planless system, is another riddle that is difficult to solve. The mention of political action to them along socialist lines is likely to horrify the real conservative "labor leader" fully as much as the most uncompromising, Parryized plutocrat. Even though the rank and file are unresponsive, "not ready," as claimed etc., and, as a rule, the members are more inclined to be progressive than the officials—that is no reason why the leaders should not lead, speaking in a political expense. But Gompers, Duncan, Mitchell, O'Connell and the rest of the crowd in control of the Federation would rather attack and suppress the radicals in their own ranks than to combat the capitalist class and strip it of its privileges. If you are a Republican or Democrat and stupidly vote the same blamed old machine ticket each year you are regarded with favor by the aforementioned gentlemen, but if you are a Socialist you immediately become an object of suspicion. They inform the world that you are a no good trade unionist and abuse you like a pirate, and then, if you withdraw and start a show of your own, you become the worst double-dyed villain on earth. It is as much a crime today to advocate overthrowing tyrannical exploiters as it was a century ago or two thousand years ago or in the time of Moses or any other time. If the master class will condescend to reduce the labor time somewhat or concede an increase in wages of ten per cent, in order to permit the leaders to boast of their wonderful accomplishments, the praises of that class will be sung, even though the price of bread and meat and clothing and shelter be advanced double the amount.

Therefore, it need cause no surprise when such parasitical institutions as the Corporations Auxiliary take advantage of the situation created by the conservatives to discredit them and profit at their expense. Likely as not these grafting agencies will soon issue special secret circulars pointing out who are safe and sane leaders and who are hateful radicals in their endeavor to obtain chunks of that \$1,500,000 that is to be accumulated by the National Association of Manufacturers as well as proportionate amounts set aside by other employers' associations, trusts and combines to make war upon labor.

As is well known in every case where there is a fundamental principle at stake brought in the high courts labor is usually handed a lemon and consequently the Parryites are elated. This has been once more demonstrated in the United States Supreme Court decision in the test case to compel government contractors to obey the eight-hour law in dredging harbors, rivers, etc., and to which attention was called in this department of the Review several months ago. The eight-hour law limits the employment of mechanics and laborers on public works to eight hours a day. The dredging companies have flagrantly violated the law, and owing to agitation among the workers test cases were brought in Massachusetts and Ohio. The defendant companies of contractors were prosecuted and found guilty in the lower courts and in time their cases found their way into the United States Supreme Court—the same body that recently placed the seal of approval upon kidnaping, especially when it concerned workingmen. The upper court starts out by declaring that the eight-hour law is constitutional, but held that it “does not apply to laborers and mechanics on dredges, and that men so employed cannot be held to be employed upon public works.” The novel excuse is also offered that persons working on dredges “are not laborers and mechanics” but are seamen, to whom the law is not applicable. In other words, if dredgemen are not employed upon public works, then it follows that the rivers and harbors are privately owned. This is the view that is undoubtedly taken by the vessel owners' associations and dock combines that control the waterways as thoroughly as ever the pirates controlled the Spanish main. Probably the last Congress voted \$87,000,000 for river and harbor improvements for the benefit of the modern pirates for the same reason that the manufacturing barons have been subsidized with tariffs and that fortunes might be piled up for certain individual labor skimmers amounting into hundreds of millions. Then, again, if a dredgeman is not a laborer or mechanic, but a seaman, what is a seaman? Is he some sort of curiosity or freak? This august tribunal known as the United States Supreme Court is becoming quite a joke factory. Doubtless it has great amusement when a labor case is brought before it. The judges probably read the A. F. of L. convention proceedings as they related to some of the jurisdictional disputes and decided to destroy the eight-hour law piecemeal, just as some of the charter rights of international bodies are being invaded by the crazy craft autonomists. The judges are a lot of wise old owls. They will allow others to solve the puzzle: What is a seaman? What is a cook? What is a laborer or mechanic? Why is it?

SOCIALISM ABROAD

AUSTRIA.

After Finland comes Austria, each marking a long step forward in the progress of the International Army of Socialism. In both countries the election followed close upon a hard battle for universal suffrage and while in Austria "Universal" still excluded one sex, yet the advantage over previous conditions was great. In the first ballot fifty-six socialists were elected and the number was largely increased in the second ballot although to just what extent it is as yet impossible to say. The total socialist representatives in the Reichstag will be about eighty.

This places both Austria and Finland ahead of Germany in the number of socialist representatives.

The Christian socialists, who have nothing whatever in common with socialism except the name, had expected a much greater gain than they received. The national parties were almost completely crushed out.

"Even in Bohemia," says L'Humanité, "the classic land of race battles, the national parties were crushed. Pan-Germanists and young Bohemians have been particularly wiped out The industrial villages have everywhere elected socialists. Twenty-eight of our comrades were elected on the first ballot in Bohemia."

Such old and well known socialists as Victor Adler, David and Ellenbogen were elected with a greatly increased count. The total number of socialist votes is not yet obtainable but 184,762 were cast in Vienna in contrast with 100,223 at the election of 1901. At this rate the total socialist vote would be something over one million. It is generally agreed that the result is due to the magnificent organization of the Austrian Socialist Party. Says Vorwaerts: "Magnificent as is the result, the methods by which it was attained are equally glorious. The Austrian Party was the victor in the electoral battle because of its skilful utilization of the situation, by its wise adaptation to the essentials of victory without at the same time falling into an unprincipled opportunism. The Austrian Social Democracy can proudly boast of having set forth the principles of socialism with a sharpness not exceeded by any other socialist party. Its agitation was free from all phases of demagogism and was based upon the spirit of Marxism."

SWEDEN.

The Swedish socialists are making a strong fight for an extension of the suffrage. They have just succeeded in securing the passage by both legislative chambers of a measure reducing the property quali-

fications for voting in a considerable degree. But this will not go into effect until 1909.

The Woman's Suffrage movement has gained most remarkable strength. Recently a great meeting was held in Stockholm where the largest assembly hall, a great building intended for the accommodation of circuses, was filled and thousands crowded the streets outside. Among the speakers at this meeting was the well known socialist Hjalmar Branting.

As a result of this great movement nearly all the Swedish parties are now claiming to favor woman's suffrage, yet the fact is that the only party that has dared to put a plank demanding this right for women in its platform is the socialist, and this party is the only one that is taking any effective steps towards the attainment of the desired privilege.

JAPAN.

The Japanese socialists are just experiencing a severe persecution. Their meetings have nearly all been broken up; their organizations been disbanded and the government has at last succeeded in permanently suppressing the daily paper which started out with such favorable prospects. Under these conditions the Japanese socialists have announced that for the time at least, they will give up all attempts to publish the paper or to maintain a public organization but will confine themselves to such work of agitation and education as may be carried on secretly, waiting for a more favorable opportunity for open work.

SPAIN.

Spain has once more been going through the farce of an election. The result which was predetermined before the ballots were cast, was the election by an overwhelming majority of the conservatives. The suffrage is so restricted and management of the elections so corrupt that the socialists could expect no result.

It is slightly significant that the number of republicans (who advocate the abolition of the monarchy and establishment of a republic) increased their seats in the Upper House from five to seven.

FRANCE.

Recent elections held in Paris for the City Council have seen an increase in the socialist vote and the addition of two members, Brousse and Brunet, to the number of socialist Councilors.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Turn of the Balance, by Brand Whitlock. Bobbs-Merril, Cloth, 622 pp., \$1.50.

This is strong meat for the average novel reader. It is the story of a man hounded to his death by the law. To those who have gained their idea of the law from orthodox sources, to whom it is a symbol for protection and justice and fairness between men, this book will come with crushing jar. The law here is a tigerish creature that hunts a working-class family to the uttermost depths. It drives the central figure on from crime to crime and finally lands him in the electric chair, the victim of the law that finally kills him. It sends his sister to the brothel, and forces his father to commit suicide.

The very lid of the social hell is lifted and we get glimpses of the nether world where the victims of capitalism rot and suffer and die. There is a love story running through it, that serves as more than a thread on which to hang the lesson. Indeed the lesson is never preached. The author is too much of an artist for that.

The criticism which might be made is that in its philosophy the book is distinctly anarchistic. It stops short with inculcating a hatred of the law as it is and offers no suggestion of any way out. Not that it would have been artistic to have stuck a speech on socialism, or a description of the co-operative commonwealth into the mouths of one of the characters as some less artistic writers have done in similar cases. But if the picture was to have been wholly true it should have shown that after all the workers are not so utterly helpless as the writer paints them. There should have been some sign of social solidarity, some touch of intelligent revolt, some recognition of class rebellion, as well as of individual hatred against social institutions. This the book lacks and this lack leaves a feeling of dissatisfaction with the reader.

Yet we must not ask too much. The ground must be cleared before the building rises, and no one who reads this book can ever again have quite the same respect for "law and order."

Family Secrets, by Marion Foster Washburne, The Macmillan Co., 212 pages, \$1.25.

Marion Foster Washburne, herself a successful editor, has put so many good things into this book that it is well worth a careful perusal. The story is that of a family of culture and education that found itself forced by conditions, over which it had no control, to migrate from its pleasant home to a rather shabby house in the straggling outskirts of the town where the life of their neighbors was filled with poverty and the hard struggle for existence.

The author pictures the stages by which the family, rooted up from all old traditions, adjusted itself to the new conditions in which it found itself. The efforts to make an old and delapidated dwelling look home-like; the keen appreciation of the nature bred by a nearer contact with woods and fields and spring winds and snow storms are told in homey fashion that win the attention and fill the imagination.

The book is replete with observations on the questions in the home that are constantly disturbing the mind of every house wife and mother. Mrs. Washburne has many excellent things to say about the training of children and she speaks from a long and successful experience.

The book is artistically well done and is so entirely above the great quantity of matter written for women that its wholesomeness is refreshing.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

AS TO FINANCES.

Apparently the optimistic report we published in this department last month had the effect of leading the comrades to suppose that no special effort was needed to keep things moving, so they settled back for a rest. At any rate our receipts slumped from \$3021.25 in April to \$1982.22 in May. Our May book sales were \$1341.87, Review receipts \$196.85, and sales of stock \$221.85. Meanwhile our expenses were far heavier than usual, since during the month we printed 50,000 copies of our Socialist Book Bulletin, 30,000 of which were sent out with the regular issue of the Chicago Daily Socialist.

An immediate outlay of several thousand dollars is necessary for the new books we are bringing out, and there is no big capitalist at hand to provide the money; we co-operative stockholders have to do it ourselves.

MONEY NEEDED NOW.

The manufacture of the second volume of "Capital" is nearly completed, and copies will probably be ready for delivery within a few days after the June Review is in the hands of its readers. The necessary outlay on this book is about \$1200. The translation by Austin Lewis of Engels' "Landmarks of Scientific Socialism" (Anti-Duehring) and Boudin's "The Theoretical System of Karl Marx" were published last month. Part of the bills are already paid and the rest are just coming due. The total is nearly \$500 for each book. La Monte's "Socialism, Positive and Negative" was published on the last day of May, and represents an outlay of \$250. The plates of Spargo's "Capitalist and Laborer" are finished, and the book will be ready early in June. This means another \$250. The plates of La-fargue's "The Right to be Lazy and Other Studies" and of our new fifty cent edition of Marx's "Revolution and Counter-Revolution" are nearly completed, and we expect to issue both of these books during June. This means another \$500. The printing and

mailing of our Socialist Book Bulletin will cost no less than \$400. An appeal has already been mailed to all paid-up stockholders and responses should soon be coming in. But a large part of the needed money should be raised from the sale of new stock, and the readers of the Review are the ones who ought to subscribe for it.

We sell books to stockholders at cost, and we must depend in large part on the money received from stock subscriptions to provide the capital for issuing new books. The 1744 socialists who have thus far subscribed for stock are mostly working people to whom ten dollars is a large sum. Moreover, many of them put in the money years ago, at a time when there was very little immediate benefit to be derived, because the variety of books issued by the publishing house was so limited. The purchase of a share now gives the right to buy at cost nearly all the socialist books in the English language that are worth reading.

SPECIAL CASH OFFER.

A share of stock costs ten dollars. For fifteen dollars cash with order we will send a full-paid stock certificate, the International Socialist Review one year, and any books published by us to the amount of fifteen dollars at retail prices, we paying expressage. On this plan the purchaser will get full value in books for his remittance, so that the share of stock, which will secure him all his socialist books at cost in future, will really cost him nothing. On the other hand, two hundred such subscriptions will give a new impetus to the work of the publishing house, enabling us to put all our energy into bringing out new books and finding new readers instead of being obliged to put a large share of it into the raising of money for immediate needs.

MARX'S CAPITAL, VOLUME TWO.

The event of the year in socialist publishing is the issue of the second volume of Marx's Capital, translated by Ernest Untermann. This volume appeared in German in 1885; it was soon after translated into French, and has long been a most important part of the armory of our socialist comrades on the continent of Europe. We have already received an advance order for five hundred copies from Swan Sonnenschein & Co., the London publishers. We have also received an order for a hundred copies from the Wilshire Book Company. But the advance orders thus far received from our 1744 stockholders up to the first of June amount to only 118 copies. We have already sold over 1500 copies of our new edition of Volume I. We had previously imported and sold over a thousand copies of the London edition, and hundreds of copies of this had undoubtedly been imported by others before we began advertising it. Moreover a New

York reprint had been widely circulated, probably to the extent of several thousand copies. This makes it evident that there will be an immense demand for the second volume when once it becomes known. But the bills for printing and binding it have to be paid now. Send your order in at once. If you are a stockholder, we will mail it for \$1.20. If not, you will have to send \$2.00, but we will if you wish credit 80c out of the \$2.00 as your first payment on a share of stock, with the understanding that you will send not less than a dollar a month until the share is paid for. In that case you can buy books at the same rates as a full-paid stockholder, while you are making your payments.

SOCIALISM, POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE.

This little book by Robert Rives La Monte, which sells for 50c with the usual discount, is something that no reader of the International Review will want to miss. It is not a book for the kindergarten, though its opening article, "Science and Socialism," is one of the best constructive statements of the socialist position ever made. But the remainder of the book tells the whole truth about socialism for socialists. It is brilliant, fearless, searching. It pricks some beautiful bubbles. It will ruffle some people's feelings. But it will leave the reader with a clearer view of socialism and a better understanding of his own mental make-up. And it is delightful reading. Now ready.

LANDMARKS OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM (ANTI-DUEHRING).

An extended review of this book by A. M. Simons appears elsewhere in this issue. Little has been said of the book thus far in our announcements, but we are now ready to fill all orders for it on the day they are received, and it should be in every socialist library, however small. One dollar, to stockholders 60c, postpaid.

BOUDIN'S "THE THEORETICAL SYSTEM OF KARL MARX.

A student who wishes to understand the modern socialist position and to know just how little foundation there is to the claim in certain quarters that the Marxian system has been outgrown, will find this the most satisfactory book to study. We published the author's preface in this department last month. A review of the book will appear later. Meanwhile we can hardly commend the book too highly to those wishing a clear and comprehensive introduction to the study of Marx. The questions of value and surplus-value are handled in a way that is especially helpful to the beginner. One dollar, to stockholders 60c, postpaid.

BEBEL'S "WOMAN UNDER SOCIALISM."

We have made an arrangement with a New York publisher by which we are enabled to offer 250 copies of this great work by the greatest living socialist on the same terms as if we controlled its publication. It is a volume of 390 large pages, substantially bound in cloth. We will mail it (if ordered at once) to any address for \$1.00 or to any stockholder in our publishing house for 60c. We have no space here for a description, but we have described the book in our Socialist Book Bulletin, a copy of which will be mailed free on request. We can not promise to supply copies when our present lot is exhausted, and would therefore advise those wishing to make sure of the book to order at once.

LORIA'S "ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIETY."

This work by Achille Loria, an Italian professor, is one of the most useful books to make clear to the beginner the socialist principle of economic determinism. It is divided into three parts, dealing respectively with the economic foundations of morality, of the law, and of politics. We have for several years been importing copies from London, but at so high a cost that we could not afford to advertise the book. We have just concluded a new arrangement by which the sale of this book will pay its fair proportion of the general expenses of the publishing house, and we have laid in a large supply. It is a book of 400 pages, price \$1.25, to stockholders 75c, postpaid.

SPECIAL OFFERS.

We desire here to call attention to two special offers which are fully explained in the Socialist Book Bulletin.

For one dollar we will mail the Review six months and a full set of sixty socialist booklets, including all the numbers of the Pocket Library of Socialism with a number of larger pamphlets. These books sell separately for five cents each. There is no profit in this offer, but there is any amount of propaganda. The offer applies either to renewals or new subscriptions. We will if desired send the Review to one address for a year and two sets of the books for \$2.00.

The other offer is that for fifty cents we will mail five American copyright novels in paper covers, four copyright books in cloth binding, or a miscellaneous assortment of paper covered books worth \$2.00 at retail prices. For one dollar we will send all three combinations by express at purchaser's expense.

These offers are not limited to stockholders, but are open to any reader of the Review. The selection of books must be left to us; the offers are made to close out a miscellaneous lot of books which we have on hand, and as there are only a few copies of each title, we can not publish a list of them. Address,

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY (Co-operative).
264 East Kinzie Street, Chicago.